THE CHURCHMAN.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 *Tim.* iii. 15.

VOL. V. No. 23. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1835. WHOLE NUMBER, 231.

For the Churchman.

"Religion but a Dream."

A MIND untutor'd by the schoolmen's art,
Skill'd in the logic of a holy heart,
In youth untaught to duly wander o'er
The glorious realms—the paths of classic lore;
Whose thirst is quench'd not at Castalia's fount,
Whose thoughts ne'er linger round the minstrel's mount;
A mind that quaffs a clearer, purer rill,
And hovers o'er another, holier hill,—
The cross-crown'd mount, where erst the Saviour trod,—
The stream of life which laves the throne of GOD.
Yes! such a mind, though sages scoff, may be
Match for the sceptics' cold philosophy.

Behold the cottage where the aged crone
Sits by her hearth-side, friendless and alone,
In silence shivering o'er the scanty fire,
And as the dying embers slow expire,
In nature's poesy, feels each earthly tie
Is doom'd, like them, to brighten and to die!
While heartfelt sorrow claims one burning tear
For loved companion, and for children dear,
The cherish'd comforts of her early day,
Which fled with life's bright morning dream away.
And she must wander down the vale alone,
No kindred heart to pulsate to her own;
No friend to sympathize with grief; to share
Earth's storm and sunshine—happiness—despair.
To-day's bright promise, and the cloud of sorrow
Which dims the dawning of the wish'd-for morrow;
Toiling long moments in employment rude,
For the poor pittance of her daily food,
And haunted even in night's soft repose
By retrospection, worst of mortal woes;
Destined to linger threescore years and ten,
A thing of sorrows, and in death—*ah then!*
In life or death, can hope that dwelling crown?
From the old nook she takes her Bible down,
Turns o'er its pages to that joyous strain—
Mother, weep not! thy dead shall live again;
And reads with faith and holy joy, how blest
CHRIST's own departed in their hallow'd rest,
Their home of faith, their blooming bowers of peaec,
Where sin disturbs not, and where labors cease,
And parting words are sadly breathed no more.
But the cold skeptic seeks her humble door;
And how the mourner's stricken heart must fail,
As his lips murmur—'Tis an idle tale,
An *empty dream*—a shadow—fleeting—vain,
By falsehood bred in weak delusion's brain.
Hark to her voice! 'tis Nature prompts the word,
The overflowing of a bosom stirr'd
With untold anguish, and that withering grief,
For which earth will not, cannot bring relief.

"A dream, alas! yet I would not awake
  From the blest influence of its magic sway,
To mark that chill grey morning coldly break,
  And night's sweet visions sadly flit away;
But ever turning from that dawn of pain,
Would sleep and dream again.

"A dream! oh what were this dull scene of life
  That glorious dream dispell'd? who then could bear
Its chilling heartlessness, its toils and strife,
  Its hours of darkness, anguish, and despair?
Wilder the tempest o'er the wanderer's head
GOD's bow of promise fled!

"A dream! its bright spell broken, who could die?
  Who then could yield the loved ones to the tomb,
Endure the dark'ning of some glorious eye,
  Which like a meteor lit the desert gloom,
Bend o'er the death-couch of earth's dearest one,
And say—GOD's will be done.

"A dream! until those parting words be spoken
  Which softly linger on the dying tongue,—
Until existence' golden bowl is broken,
  And the heart's chords are one by one unstrung,—
Till sorrows fade and pleasures cease to beam,—
May I believe that dream."

Faith ceased; and doubt, baffled, abash'd retired:
What though his soul with lofty thoughts was fired,
And GOD-like reason once burn'd bright within?
Her beams have faded in the mists of sin.
Go! quench the sun in glory throned at noon,
And seek for radiance in the midnight moon—
Then hope that reason's lesser orb can shine,
Dimm'd, quench'd and lost, religion's light divine!

Cambridge, August 10. B. D. W.

THE CHURCHMAN.

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

(*Concluded from page* 917.)

Stated Meeting.

THE Committee to whom was referred a proposed amendment of the 8th Section of Chapter 8 of the Statutes, presented a report which was read.

Moved and carried, that it be recommitted to the same Committee for further information, and that they report upon the subject at the next Stated Annual Meeting of this Board.

The Committee to whom was referred the subject of conferring degrees in divinity on the Alumni of the Seminary, presented their Report, which was read.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Report be laid on the table.

Resolved, That it be referred to a Special Committee to consider and report upon the power of this Seminary to confer degrees.

Messrs. T. L. Ogden, P. A. Jay, and W. Johnson, were appointed this Committee.

A communication from the Faculty was read recommending the members of the Senior Class, viz. J. Lyman Clarke, Joseph L. Darrow, Henry M. Davis, Edward M. Forbes, Alfred E. Ford, John W. French, William Homman, Daniel V. M. Johnson, William I. Kip, R. H. Ranney, Thomas H. Vail, Alexander H. Vinton, William F. Walker, Henry Waterman, William Watson, Henry F. M. Whitesides, and Henry Zell, as duly qualified to receive the usual testimonial upon completing the usual course of studies.

Whereupon it was *Resolved*, That the above-mentioned members of the Senior Class receive the usual testimonial on the part of the Trustees, under the seal of this Board.

The Committee on the State of the Seminary reported as follows:—

The Committee on the General State of the Seminary report, That in the discharge of their duty they have visited several of the apartments, made inquiries as to the condition of those not visited, and taken a general survey of the premises. They have found the building in good preservation, and the rooms, for the most part, in good repair. They invite attention to some of the dormitories, in which the ceiling has fallen, and an examination of the others, in that respect, lest injury be done to the occupants. In regard to cleanliness, the Committee observe very great improvement. The abuses on the premises, alluded to in the last report, no longer exist; and if a few of the rooms had received attention more recently, there would be nothing to lament in this particular, so essential to health, decency, and good order, and so nearly kindred with good morals.

The employment of a matron, recommended in the last report on the state of the Seminary, is deferred, the Committee observe, until the completion of the new building. In the meantime, the Committee recommend the employment of a janitor, competent to act, under the direction of the Committee of the Students, in making the purchases, and attending to the minor arrangements necessary in providing for the common table; who shall also be a married man, and take the charge and direction of the servants employed in the Institution. Obvious reasons will appear to all for the adoption of such an arrangement. It cannot be expected that the students can effectually control the domestic economy of this part of the establishment; and, without effectual control, great abuses may be expected to occur.

The Committee, having instituted accurate inquiry into the expenses of residence at the Seminary, find them to be as follows:

Boarding, (at an average cost of 22 cents per day, during the term of nine months, or 263 days,) is	$57 86
Washing, (at an average of 28 cents per week,) is	10 64
Lights, (for the whole period in each room,)	5 00
Fuel, (for the whole period, two students occupying each room,) will cost each of them	7 00
Expenses for the whole time, (exclusive of clothes, travelling and contingencies,)	$80 50

In relation to the proposed amendment of the 1st Section of Chapter 7 of the Statutes, specially referred to them for inquiry and consideration, the Committee report, that, in their judgment it is expedient so to amend the said provision, that it shall require of candidates for admission into the Seminary, that they be examined upon the rules and principles of English composition, and also that they present a specimen of their proficiency in that important exercise.

The Committee further recommend that it be required of candidates for admission into the Seminary, hereafter, that they be able to read the Hebrew text with accuracy and fluency; and that all candidates for admission into the Seminary, after the year 1837, be able to translate and analyze, well and truly, at least seven chapters of the Hebrew Bible. Among the many obvious benefits of this requirement, which the Committee deem to be due from the Seminary to the Church, there will result the provision of fuller time for attention, on the part of the students, to those important exercises which accustom and enable them to arrange with accuracy, strength and beauty, and to deliver with propriety and force, the results of their various studies, in the discharge of the public duties of the pastoral office; a department which, the Committee are of opinion, cannot be too frequently or too forcibly urged upon the Trustees.

In conclusion, the Committee offer for adoption by the Board, the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the attention of the Standing Committee be especially directed to the condition of the ceilings in the several rooms, and to the adoption of more suitable and efficient arrangements for the control of the domestic economy of the Seminary.

Resolved, That Section 1st of Chapter 7 of the Statutes be so amended as to read, after the words "in the New Testament," "and the candidates shall also sustain an examination upon the rules and principles of English composition, and present a specimen of their proficiency in that department."

Resolved, That after the above addition to Section 1st of Chapter 7 of the Statutes, there be further added the following,—"and it is expected further of all candidates who may present themselves hereafter for admission to the Seminary, that they be able to read the Hebrew text with accuracy and fluency; and, after the year 1837, that they be able to sustain an examination on not less than seven chapters of the Hebrew Bible."

Resolved, That a portion of the time to be gained for the course of studies, by the provisions of the last resolution, be appropriated to the exercises of the composition and delivery of sermons, under the direction of the Professor of Pastoral Theology and Pulpit Eloquence.

All which is respectfully submitted.

G. W. DOANE,
N. S. WHEATON,
FLOYD SMITH,
WM. COOPER MEAD, } *Committee.*

The Report of the Committee was accepted, and on motion, the 1st and 2d resolutions therein contained, were adopted.

The 3d resolution being under consideration, as a substitute, the following was offered and adopted:—

Resolved, That from and after the ensuing examination of candidates for admission into the Seminary, they shall stand a satisfactory examination upon the primary elements of the Hebrew tongue.

The 4th resolution, as recommended by the Committee, was then adopted.

A communication was laid before the Board, from the Students, requesting the use of a room in the Seminary for the library of the "Missionary Association." The subject, on motion, was referred to the Standing Committee, with power.

The Board then adjourned, to meet again at St. John's Chapel as soon as the exercises of the Commencement had closed.

St. John's Chapel, June 26th, 1835, two o'clock, P. M.

The Trustees met, pursuant to adjournment.

Present,—Right Rev. Bishops Brownell, H. U. Onderdonk, and Doane—Rev. Drs. Creighton, Mead, M'Vickar, Milnor, Berrian—Rev. Messrs. Breintnall, Cuming, Eastburn, Schroeder, Taylor, Rodney, Croes—Messrs. Johnson, Harison, Lorillard, Smith, E. R. Jones, and the Secretary.

The Minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Committee on the Examination of the Students reported as follows:—

The Committee appointed to attend the Examination of the Students respectfully report,—

That they have attended to the duty assigned them, in which they have been chiefly occupied during the last three days. The examinations which they have attended were of the Senior Class, by Professor Wilson, in Systematic Divinity; of the Middle Class, by Professor Turner, in the Criticism of the Greek Testament; and of the Junior Class, in Hebrew, by Professor Moore. The examinations were, on the whole, as much to the satisfaction of the Committee as was to be expected from the mode of conducting them as hitherto authorized by the Board. The increasing number of the Students will soon, it is believed, require a different system; which, while it will occupy less time in each department, will increase the comfort and satisfaction of the Professors, and better display the proficiency of the Students. They earnestly hope that it may receive the early and earnest attention of the Trustees.

All which is respectfully submitted.

G. W. DOANE,
L. P. BAYARD,
MANTON EASTBURN, } *Committee.*

On motion, *Resolved*, That this Report be accepted.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Secretary be, and he is hereby empowered to have the usual testimonial given by this Board at Commencements, engraved.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Board proceed to the election of a Treasurer, Standing Committee, and Finance Committee, for the year ensuing.

Upon counting the ballots, the following gentlemen were found to be duly elected, viz.

Treasurer—Mr. E. R. Jones.

Standing Committee—Rev. Dr. Lyell, Rev. Dr. Berrian, Rev. Dr. Milnor, Rev. Dr. Creighton, Rev. Dr. Hawks, Rev. Dr. M'Vickar, Mr. T. L. Ogden, Mr. D. S. Jones, Mr. Isaac Lawrence, Mr. P. A. Jay, Mr. J. Lorillard, Mr. F. Smith; together with Mr. Edward R. Jones, *Treasurer;* Rev. Dr. Anthon, *Secretary*.

Finance Committee—Mr. Isaac Lawrence, Mr. P. A. Jay, Mr. J. Lorillard, Mr. F. Smith; together with the Treasurer.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Secretary, the Treasurer, and Mr. Lorillard, be a committee to prepare the report required by the 2d article of the Constitution, to be presented to the General Convention, and that they submit said report to this Board at its Stated Meeting in August next.

Ordered, That the Secretary publish, with all convenient despatch, the proceedings of the Board during its present Annual Meeting.

The Board of Trustees then adjourned.

Attested,
HENRY ANTHON,
Secretary of the Board.

From the Eclectic Review—Review of Townsend.

MORAL REGENERATION.

IN the outset of the Epistle to the Romans, he has fixed with great exactitude the thesis he proposed to illustrate, where he professes to show cause why he should not be ashamed of the Gospel; for which he assigns this capital reason, that it was 'the power of GOD to salvation to every one that believeth, unto the Jew first, and also to the Greek.' He proceeds to show the equal exposure of Jew and Gentile to the sentence and penalty of that law, which both had violated; the Jew having broken the law of Moses, the Gentile that of conscience engraven upon the heart; and his design plainly was, not to convert Heathens into Jews, or to reconcile the one to a confraternity with the other, but to convert both into Christians. Then, as the phrase Jew and Greek, is the well known periphrasis for all mankind, a child may see that, in the conduct of the argument, the Apostle has to do with human nature, as such, in all its varieties; with the acknowledged fact of man's moral depravity, (of which heathen degeneracy is only one of the various forms,) with the burden of a long-existing controversy between a holy GOD and his apostate offspring, and with the wonderful expedient which Infinite Wisdom has originated for bringing that controversy to an issue, by the death of CHRIST as an atonement for our sins, and by the influences of the Spirit renewing the Divine image upon the mind.

To resolve all this into a mere transition from a profession of Heathenism to a profession of Christianity, we hold to be miserable logic, and worse divinity; and to suppose that, in those sublime passages of the New Testament, in which the necessity of spiritual renovation is so decisively spoken of, nothing more can be meant than receiving idolaters within the pale of the visible Church, by the outward rite of baptism, is to deprive words of their meaning, and to trifle with the common sense of mankind. Far from illustrating the superior glory of the new dispensation, this scheme would reduce us beneath the level of the Jewish Church; for Judaism itself fully recognises the paramount importance of Divine influence to effect that transformation of character to which no inferior power is equal; as our LORD, arguing with the rabbi Nicodemus upon the subject of the new birth, most cogently urges—'Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?' When David prays, 'Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me,' he certainly asks for something more than could be realized by a formal transition from one creed to another, or than all the sacrifices and appliances of his own law, considered as mere forms, could possibly achieve. When GOD promises to Israel by Ezekiel—'A new heart will I give thee, and a new spirit will I put within thee, and cause thee to walk in my statutes,' we must believe, unless this be a mockery of human intellect and human hope, that those measures of Divine influence should be accorded to the suppliant, which are requisite to restore the lost image of GOD, and effectually to incline the bias of the mind to his holy and happy service. Yet, upon the miserable theory under discussion, when similar expressions are employed in the New Testament, they are to be applied almost exclusively to Pagan idolaters, and to a transition from the gross enormities of the worship of Venus, or Astarte, to the purer morality of the later dispensation! Surely when the prayer is offered, that 'GOD from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed, would give unto his servants that peace which the world cannot give;' or, when it is supplicated, that 'we being regenerate, and rendered GOD's children by adoption and grace, may *daily* be *renewed* by the HOLY SPIRIT,'—something far higher and more spiritual is referred to than a mere external or national conversion, as from Druidism to Popery, or from Popery to the Protestant faith.

In the present times, moreover, when much is heard of the growth of Popery, peculiar importance must be attached to this controversy, for whatever obscures the leading doctrines of Christianity, tends to sap the foundations of the Protestant faith. If it be true, as we think might be shown, that this method of disposing of the more spiritual doctrines of Christianity has been adopted by the supporters of opposite and erroneous systems,—by Unitarians on the one hand, and by Roman Catholic and Pelagian divines on the other,—we submit whether the advocates of a purer faith can safely rely upon a principle of interpretation which appears to conduct to such different results, parties equally unfriendly to the doctrines of the Reformation. It is more than doubtful if the first Reformers, or the writers of the Homilies, or Hooker in his noble discourse on justification, would have been able to maintain, as they did, the distinguishing truths of the Gospel, had they been fettered by this assumed and restrictive scheme. Upon the two fundamental doctrines of expiation by the cross of CHRIST, and renovation by the agency of the HOLY SPIRIT, not Protestantism only, but the quenchless and immortal hope of innumerable minds, is made to depend; and Christianity itself derives its supreme title to regard, from the manner in which, by these essential truths, the great exigency of the moral world, produced by the awful catastrophe of sin, is met and relieved. With the uncompromising advocacy of these principles, Protestantism began; with the neglect of them it must inevitably decline; and any attempt to throw them into the shade, or to weaken their influence upon the mind, in order to conciliate worldly men, must signally fail.

THE SHORT CANDLE.

As I lately sat in my chamber I saw a little girl working by the light of a candle. It was burnt down almost to the socket. I perceived that she plied her needle very fast, and at length I overheard her saying to herself, "I must be very industrious, for this is the only candle I have, and it is almost gone."

What a moral there is, thought I, in the words of this child! Surely I may learn wisdom from it. Life is but a short candle. It is almost gone, and I have no other. How earnestly engaged should I then be in every duty of life. While I have the light of life, how careful should I be to perform every thing enjoined by my heavenly Master.

1. I ought to be in haste to work out my own salvation with fear and trembling, knowing that when this light is extinguished there is no other allowed to mortals for preparation.

2. I ought to be all alive to the immortal interests of my fellow-creatures; working while it is called to-day; striving to bring sinners to the Lord JESUS CHRIST, for my brief candle is soon to go out; and there can be no conversion of sinners in another world.

3. I ought to be unceasingly active in every work of benevolence, making as many happy as I can; relieving the miserable, and doing good to all within my reach; for this light is soon to be put out; and in the other world the miserable and suffering will be beyond my reach.

4. I ought to use every talent for the glory of GOD and the kingdom of CHRIST; working the works of Him that sent me while it is day, because the night cometh in which no man can work.

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest." Eccl. ix. 10.

S. S. Journal.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

DIVISION OF DIOCESES.

MR. EDITOR,—The question growing out of the present situation of the Diocese of New-York, to be determined by the General Convention now sitting, is, I humbly conceive, one of the most important ever yet mooted in the councils of our Church. According to its decision, we are to approach on the one hand the primitive simplicity of the Christian communities before the time of Constantine, or on the other, the formal and cumbersome stateliness of our mother Church in Britain. Our legislators are to choose between the love of principle and the fear of man—the love of the principle of apostolic order, in its simplicity and completeness, and the fear of man, as his ambition and the evil passions of his deceitful heart make him a corrupter and perverter of the holiest and wisest institutions.

For the five years last past I have foreseen the occurrence of this crisis. It has been the subject of serious reflection, and of frequent converse with one or two whose friendship is among my choicest blessings. Myself apart from the councils of the Church, and at present even in an especial degree uninterested in their decisions, I have felt strongly the weight of your judicious observation concerning the impropriety of intermeddling in matters perhaps too high for me, certainly best settled in calm discussion by our accredited legislators. But, Sir, I cannot see others bringing the question before the public in what I deem a false light, and hold my peace. Still less can I pass by your own adhesion to an opinion utterly opposed to the result of my inquiries and deliberations, without an attempt to call your attention to views which may not have occurred to you—at least, have received no notice in the brief statement of your sentiments now before me.

I entirely agree with you, Sir, and with the able writer in the Protestant Episcopalian, (whose article is also now before me, in the shape of a separate pamphlet,) as to the first of the two "particular questions," which you rightly represent as the "most important" involved in the general subject of debate. While our present federation of dioceses exists, a state convention cannot act on a question which affects fundamental principles of that confederation. The coincidence of ecclesiastical boundaries with the civil, throughout our land, in the division of dioceses and states, at least so far as representation is concerned,* is assumed in the constitution of our Church. The distribution of the representation is based on that assumption. The constitution of the House of Bishops has the same basis. That house, possessing an equal originative power with the lower house, and the full right of veto, lies open to the unjust influence of any state which may choose to subdivide itself till the bishops of its constituent dioceses form a majority. On the other hand, a state so doing would present in the lower house the anomalous example of, say 15 or 20 dioceses possessing but a single delegation, and, at the call of any other state, but a single vote!—It is clear that such a state of things could never have been in the contemplation of the founders of our polity. They have not forbidden it, it is true—probably for the same reason that the Romans were so long without a law against parricide: but to take advantage of their negligence would be, at least in my poor judgment, little less than a breach of common honesty and good faith.

I equally agree with the writer in the Protestant Episcopalian in a decided preference of the *division* of states, before any other mode of provision for the discharge of Episcopal functions in sections grown too large for the care of a single bishop. *Assistant* bishops, *coadjutor* bishops, and *suffragan* bishops, are all departures from the pure Episcopal constitution of the Church, and, in so far, approaches either to parity on the one hand, or to tyranny (whether called *papal* or *patriarchal*, matters little) on the other. This would be *my* reason for rejecting them.† One or all of these forms of Episcopacy may, in divers circumstances, become a necessary evil—the provision of an assistant, for instance, for a bishop who is disabled by age or infirmity. But in making permanent provision for the well-being of the Church, it would be worse than folly to choose an evil, if another alternative exist. Such an alternative is afforded by *division*, or in other words, *reduction of the limits* of existing dioceses, until they become commensurate with the abilities of an individual to discharge the episcopal functions so as may be most for the advantage of the Church. The measure is a novelty: it is a great departure from the principles on which our Church is at present organized, and which, in some measure, she derived from her transatlantic mother. But this does not startle me. Our situation is more novel than this change will be. Never since the fourth century, was a Church placed in a state of freedom from mundane shackles equal to that we enjoy. Never, perhaps, since the third, did a Church contain within itself so many of the elements of vigorous growth, and find, in its external relations, so much to call them into action. Well were it for the Church of England, if she were in like circumstances, equally at liberty to adopt the seeming novelty, *as she has long desired.*

Here, Mr. Editor, we part company. We have jointly arrived at the conclusion that *dioceses must be divided:* but the question now arises, How? on what general principle? We give up the principle of coincidence between the limits of civil and of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. We must adopt some other. Either that must be, to be ruled by circumstances, as they arise, and *reduce* only as it becomes impossible to get along without; or, it must be, a supposed limit, best suited to the wants, best accordant with the constitution of the Church.

I hope there are few Churchmen willing to adopt the first of these alternatives. There are enough of existing collisions, enough of perplexing questions of expediency, continually arising out of the circumstances of a growing Church, planted in a country where the opinion of the people and the will of the people are all powerful—there is enough of perplexity and irritation unavoidably entailed on our ecclesiastical legislation, without our having recourse to the poor shift of leaving individual cases to be settled as they arise, when it is possible to ascertain and lay down a general principle for their determination.

Such general principle, when ascertained, may be fixed either by precedent, or by positive legislation. The General Convention, *e. g.* may proceed at once to recommend to the State of New-York a sub-division, say into four, five or six dioceses, or into so many dioceses as shall leave to each a given number of parishes and of clergymen; or, without direct reference to any individual case, it may provide a canon, authorizing or directing the reduction of any diocese which may now exceed, or shall hereafter grow to exceed, a stated number of parishes and of clergymen; or, lastly, it may combine the two methods, and authorizing immediate procedure in the case of New-York, provide at the same time a rule for that procedure and for all following time, or for all existing cases to which the rule so provided might apply. The writer in the Protestant Episcopalian sets aside the first and last of these methods of procedure; assigning as reasons for his preference, the expediency of due deliberation, and the presumed unreadiness of the Diocese of New-York for immediate action. Of such unreadiness I have yet to be convinced: nay, in my ignorance, I have considered the course of events at and since the last Diocesan Convention as proof to the contrary. That *due* deliberation is needful before a permanent rule for the reduction of dioceses be adopted, I heartily allow; and trust that the deliberation so bestowed will be serious and thorough. Yet I cannot but regard the allowance of the interval between two General Conventions for that purpose, as unnecessary; and when I turn to the records of the proceedings of that council, find very little reason to think that such postponement would at all conduce to intelligent, discreet, and profitable action.

It does not, indeed, appear to have occurred to the writer in the Protestant Episcopalian that the *division* (I prefer the term *reduction*) of dioceses does not necessarily involve an alteration of the present system of representation. And *therefore* he presumes (and on his view, rightly,) that an alteration of the present constitution of the Church would be needful; and for such alteration finds it necessary to allow *six years*, at the expiration of which period he supposes that the Diocese of New-York *might* be ready for *division into* TWO!!!

All this delay is very needless, and nothing but my respect for the able writer hinders me from calling it preposterous. New-York is as ready to act now as she ever will be. The diocese and the bishop agree in the opinion that the charge is now too great for one. The General Convention can, by resolution or otherwise, sanction a reduction, and lay down the rule, at the present session. An article to be inserted in the constitution of the Church, providing for a corresponding change in the system of representation, may be drafted and "proposed" in the same session. The action of the State Conventions can be had in the interval before the next assemblage of the General Convention. Final proceedings may then take place, and nothing hinders but that a representation of the new dioceses constituted under the resolution of the present session, should be provisionally chosen, and admitted under the new article of the constitution, in the same session. Thus New-York would be immediately relieved, the new footing of the polity of the Church permanently settled, and all consummated in three years. It is hardly necessary to observe, that no new cases which might arise out of the general rule that the Convention should see fit to adopt, could be acted on before the final settlement of the constitution.

Still the great question remains untouched. However the Convention may see proper to act, *What* is the general rule by which it is to be governed, in fixing precedent, passing a canon, or altering the constitution? You, Sir, and the writer in the Protestant Episcopalian say, "*Avoid the multiplication of bishops.* Divide, if divide you must; but as little as you may. Fix the minimum of extent for a diocese as high as possible." Your correspondent, on the contrary, and others far worthier of attention than he, *desire* the multiplication of bishops, and the diminution of dioceses *much* beyond the present standard. We would, indeed, have a minimum fixed at once; but a minimum regulated by primitive standard, and views, not of human frailty and a secularized ministry, but of the Episcopal office and functions, as understood and discharged by those who first received them.

Since I have been capable of forming a judgment in the premises, the Constitution of our American Episcopal Church has appeared to me *un*primitive in this respect. That it should be so, was matter of regret, but seemed to have been unavoidable, in the circumstances attending its first organization. Nor did change seem to be expedient, until obvious necessity should force a departure from the present system of division of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Then, indeed, the subject would come up, as *de novo;* and then, I have fondly hoped, the fathers and counsellers of our Church would perceive the incongruity of *our* diocesan limits with those of primitive Episcopacy, and resolve to place Episcopacy in America, in this respect as it is pre-eminently in so many others, on the footing which it held in the beginning. The occasion looked for, has at length arrived; but I am surprised and grieved to find that those who alone have spoken their sentiments on the subject, regard the existing state of things as correct, and seek to limit any departure which may be forced, the utmost possible. The writer in the Protestant Episcopalian gravely assumes it as an axiom that "bishops are not to be multiplied," and consequently, that "dioceses are not to be reduced:" and you, Sir, talk of *centrifugal* and *centripetal* principles, and avow yourself an advocate of the latter, and express your wish that "the Church may not outstrip the country in the march of *nullification*," *i. e.*, I suppose, by causing the authority and influence of the House of Bishops to dwindle.

I believe, Sir, that this aversion to the multiplication of bishops arises from the fear that less care would be taken to *fill* the Episcopal office with men of due "sound learning, piety and discretion," should the dioceses become in any degree numerous. Is not this fear gratuitous? Is there more danger to be apprehended from the mediocrity of many, than from the ambition of few—from the neutralized influence of a large body, or from the tendency to domination and oppression of the smaller? This is plain language, Sir, but it accords with the views taken by the writer in the Episcopalian. If we *must* reason from the infirmities of poor frail humanity, let us take them *all* into account, and consider whether there is not more risk than gain by keeping up the size of our dioceses, and the con-

---

*I make this limitation, because the words "bishop *or bishops*" in Article IV., taken in connection with the subsequent clause, "diocese or *district*" in the same Article, seem to me to cover the case of the subdivision of the Church in one state into several dioceses, having each its independent bishop. Still the representation of that state, so subdivided, must, by the provisions of Article II., continue *one and undivided*, unincreased, and in no otherwise affected by the division, than as the mode of election might be changed from a joint election of the whole delegation, to a separate election of the several members to represent single dioceses. Whether the existing provisions of Article II. would require such election to be made in a single joint convention of the several diocesan subdivisions of the state, is a debateable point.

†I cannot, with the writer in the Episcopalian, discuss questions concerning the constitution of Christ's Church on the ground of expediency:—though even there he has, in this instance, made out a strong case—I think, irrefragable.

sequent inducement to unholy ambition, strife, and domination?

On *these* grounds, Sir, I think the position taken by those who are adverse to the multiplication of bishops, weak and unsafe. But I do not believe these grounds to be those on which the question ought to be argued. Let us determine which standard is most agreeable to the nature and design of Episcopacy, not which is most conformable to the dictates of worldly policy. Let us inquire which has the support of the past, not which is to encounter the never-certain opposition of the future, as found out by human foresight. Was Episcopacy established in a form like that which it is wished to perpetuate? Is Episcopacy best carried into effect, most complete in its operations, least alloyed with attendant dangers and drawbacks, when apportioned into large districts? I do not expect soon to meet with the man who will maintain an affirmative response to either of these questions. On the contrary, the merest tyro in church history knows, that the primitive dioceses were so small as to have afforded a pretext, not destitute of plausibility, for the pretence that they were rather *parishes*, in the modern acceptation of the term; and that the large and powerful dioceses of Rome, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Antioch, have been from the beginning nurseries of corruption, and conservatories of dissension in the Church. Ask the past, and it will tell you that not the humble simplicity of multitudinous overseers of small portions of the Church, but the astute and influential talents of men capable of aspiring to the charge of large districts and numerous bands of clerical brethren, have wrought mischief to the Church and confusion in her councils.

This on the assumption, which I am far from granting, that an increase in the number of our dioceses will lower the standard of Episcopal qualifications and character. But look at the question in another light. Will it be seriously maintained that the wisdom and efficiency of the House of Bishops, as a deliberative and legislative assembly, are likely to be lessened by the increase of its numbers, present requisitions and views regarding the episcopate being unchanged? If so, the Book of Truth must err when it affirms that, "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety," for this would be a case precisely within the scope of that declaration, where the increase of *number* implied no change of *character*. Is a question of import to the well-being of the Church likely to receive a less fair and full investigation—to be decided on less satisfactory grounds—in an assembly of one hundred bishops, chosen each by some thirty or fifty parishes, than in our present house, able and trustworthy as that house is?

I think, Sir, that in this view of the subject it can be shown that there is less danger in subdivision than in accumulation. Still I waive the argument. Setting aside all considerations growing out of the existing relations of our Church, as a confederation of churches—relations, in the nature of things of secondary importance, and liable to continual change, I contend that our true course is to examine the bearing of the question on the Episcopal office, *quâ* the Episcopate, and by that to decide. Is a bishop, as an overseer of his brethren in the household of God, without reference to any subintroduced character of counseller in some confederacy of human origin, is he *as a bishop*, likely to discharge his office most for the good of the Church at large, of his peculiar flock, and of his own soul, in a diocese of two hundred parishes or of thirty? Is a diocese in these United States most likely to thrive and grow, if it comprise a few counties under the care of a diligent, faithful, single-hearted man, or if it spread over 20,000 square miles, with the advantage of having a Heber or a Hobart at its head? The answer which a Hobart would have given to this question shall be mine. It is within my knowledge that he, of whom I shall think with love and reverence while mind and memory last, thought his diocese, when a quarter smaller than it now is, (for surely *miles* are no measure of a church in our country,) not almost, but altogether too large for the care of one man; nay, that he actually cherished the intention of relinquishing its charge as too oppressive. He groaned under the burden of one hundred and fifty parishes, and yet we have now before us a proposition to forbid the division of a diocese which may number less than *two hundred!*

I have been so situated, Mr. Editor, as to have opportunities of close observation of the duties of the Episcopate in one of our largest dioceses and in one of our smallest, and in both, under two successive bishops. The result has been my firm conviction that from thirty to fifty parishes, as parishes are aggregated in our country, would find full employment for the energies of our most active and able men; that the Church, divided into such portions, would root itself more deeply and shoot more vigorously than it has ever yet done; that the Episcopal office, thus exercised, would be more known, respected, and felt, through all our borders; and that the increase with which God has already blessed us, would be at least quadrupled, while we became daily more complete and well-furnished for the warfare with sin and Satan.

Into *such* dioceses, then, I would wish to see our Church distributed, whenever a distribution *on principle* takes place, merely on the ground of expediency, with reference to results. I would fearlessly hazard my small share of reputation on the experiment. I would date from the day of its commencement a new era in the growth of our communion; the beginning of an epoch as far surpassing that comprised in the last five-and-twenty years, as *they* outvie the period of comparative inaction which preceded them.

And how would such a state of things compare with the primitive model? Take the reply from one of the "Tracts for the Times," sanctioned and extensively circulated within the last few months by some of the wisest and best of the many wise and good who adorn the "glory of Protestant Christendom,"—our mother Church.

"Few persons," says that Tract, (No. 33 of the series, entituled "Of *Primitive Episcopacy*,") "few persons who have not expressly examined the subject, are aware of the minuteness of the dioceses into which many parts of Christendom were divided in the first ages. Some churches in Italy were more like our rural deaneries than what we now consider dioceses; being not above ten or twelve miles in extent, and their sees not above five or six miles from each other. Even now (or at least in Bingham's time) the kingdom of Naples contains 147 sees, of which 20 are archbishoprics. Asia Minor is 630 miles long, and 210 broad; [132,300 square miles—not quite *seven* dioceses of the measure of the writer in the Prot. Episcopalian:] yet in this country there were almost 400 dioceses. Palestine is in length 160 miles, in breadth 120; [16800 square miles—not *one* of the dioceses of the writer in the Protestant Episcopalian:] yet the number of known dioceses amounted to 48. Again, in the Province of Syria Secunda, the see of Larissa (e. g.) was about 14 miles from Apamea, Arethusa 16 from Epiphania. So again, in the West, though the dioceses were generally larger, as partaking more of a missionary character, yet in Ireland there were at one time from 50 to 60 sees." p. 2.

Nor have the leading members of the Church of England been at any time unmindful of this contrast between the primitive dioceses and those of their Church, however little they may have been able to conform to the early model.

"At the time of our Reformation," says the Tract just quoted, "Archbishop Cranmer felt the deficiency of the English Church in respect of bishoprics, and projected several measures to supply it. The most complete was that of increasing the number of dioceses; availing himself of existing circumstances, he advised the King to apply the abbey lands to the founding of 20 additional sees." [It is but fair to state that five of the present dioceses were then as yet uncreated.] "The same prelate" "also projected, with great wisdom, a system of suffragan bishops or chorepiscopi, which he was able to bring into effect, and which lasted till the reign of King James. *Twenty-six* such bishops were appointed; the bishop of the diocese having the power of presenting two persons to the king, who might choose either of them, and present him to the archbishop of the province for consecration. These suffragans exercised such jurisdiction as their principal gave them, or as had formerly been committed to suffragans; their authority lasting no longer than he continued their commission to them." "After the disuse of suffragans in the reign of James I. there was a fresh project for establishing them on the Restoration. Charles, in one of his declarations, promises to increase the number of bishops, in accordance with Archbishop Usher's plan for Episcopal government." ib. p. 3, 4.

The opinion of the learned and generally accurate Bingham is in precise accordance with the above, both as to facts of history and as to the lesson to be drawn from them. "One great objection," he says, (*Antiquities*, Book IX. chap. viii. as quoted in the Tract just cited,) "against the present diocesan Episcopacy, and that which to many may look most plausible, is drawn from the vast extent and greatness of most of the northern dioceses of the world, which makes it so extremely difficult for one man to discharge all the offices of the Episcopal function. If [the Church of England] should think fit to add 60 or 100 more [to her existing dioceses,] she would not be without precedent in the practice of the primitive Church. —*Ibid.* p. 5.

What would the writer of this paragraph have thought of the limits of *our* dioceses, as now bounded? would he have believed that men would arise, who, when it was in their power to change a scheme of episcopacy so preposterously inconsistent with that of the early and pure ages, should prefer to retain it, as less inconvenient and dangerous? He thought that England, now divided into 26 dioceses, might increase their number by one hundred, and be all the more primitive. England and Wales measure about 49,500 square miles: the State of New-York 45,693. It is true that over this surface are strown, in England, 9500 parishes; in New-York, *as yet*, but 200: that England is filled with a population of nearly ten millions; New-York counts as yet, only two and a half. But are we to lay out our dioceses in strict proportion to the present population, when that population is doubling in many parts every ten years, in some every five? It is not to be denied that there will be difficulties attendant on any new apportionment of our Church into dioceses. But it will be sheer folly to postpone such an apportionment, or to make it on an imperfect and temporary principle, in the view of getting rid of such difficulties. They will but increase on us with the lapse of time and growth of population. It is in our power now to calculate with a sufficient degree of precision, the increase of population, and the more than proportionate augmentation of the number of our parishes in given sections of our country. Divisions may be made with a modified reference both to the present and to the future, fixing a *minimum* necessary for the incipient existence of an independent diocese, and portioning off our states at such minimum, with the moral certainty that the segments will rapidly fill out into the bulk needful for healthy energy and growth.

I regret extremely, Mr. Editor, that I have not time to be either brief or full. The publication in the Protestant Episcopalian appeared at the eleventh hour. It was absolutely necessary, that all hope of usefulness might not be past, to send these crude and hasty remarks as they flowed from a pen never over ready. I have run on to too great length already, and yet omitted important branches of the subject, and kept back much that has occurred to me in past frequent and anxious musings.

Nevertheless, at whatever risk of blame for presumptuousness and inconsideration, I will beg leave to subjoin a sketch of such a *reduction* of the present diocese of New-York as would appear to me and others of my way of thinking, most conformable to the primitive pattern and true genius of Episcopacy.

The State to be divided into *five dioceses*.

The first, of New-York; comprising the city and county of New-York, Long-Island and Staten-Island; in all, five counties, with a population of more than 340,000, a surface of 1530 square miles, about 40 parishes, and more than 40 clergymen.

The second, of Poughkeepsie; (or such other name as the choice of a town for the see might render expedient,) comprising the counties of Westchester, Putnam, Rockland, Sullivan, Orange, Ulster, Dutchess, Columbia, Greene and Delaware; in all ten, with a population of about 310,000, a surface of 7164 square miles, more than 30 parishes, and 30 clergymen.

The third, of Albany; comprising the counties of Albany, Rensselaer, Schoharie, Montgomery, Hamilton, Franklin, Clinton, Essex, Warren, Washington, Saratoga, and Schenectady; in all, 15, with a population of about 455,000, a surface of 16,363 square miles, 35 or 40 parishes, and more than 30 clergymen.

The fourth, of Utica; comprising the counties of Oneida, Oswego, Cayuga, Tompkins, Tioga, Onondaga, Madison, Cortland, Chenango, Broome, Lewis and Jefferson, in all 12, with a population of about 451,000, a surface of 9897 square miles, about 50 parishes, and more than 30 clergymen.

The fifth, of Rochester; (or of Buffalo, or of Geneva;) comprising the counties of Chatauque, Cattaraugus, Erie, Niagara, Orleans, Genesee, Alleghany, Livingston, Monroe, Wayne, Ontario, Yates, Steuben and Seneca; in all 14, with a population of about 430,000, a surface of 10,828 square miles, about 35 parishes, and more than 30 clergymen.

I cannot conclude better than in the words of the tract I have already so often quoted, expressing my conviction that "*the most perfect state of a Christian country would be that of* A SUFFICIENT NUMBER *of separate dioceses;*" and that whatever may be thought of "the necessity of any immediate measure of multiplying" our sees, "the GENIUS OF OUR ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEM TENDS TOWARD SUCH AN INCREASE, *and it is but a question of time which has to be determined.*"

AN EPISCOPALIAN.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1835.

Two dollars and fifty cents, if paid in advanc, or three dollars if at the end of the year, is the price per annum of subscription to this paper.

DIVISION OF DIOCESES AND MULTIPLICATION OF BISHOPS.

In much that has been written on this subject a principle has been assumed of a novel and questionable character, and which, if made the basis of legislation in our ecclesiastical councils, will prove, we fear, injurious if not fatal to the permanent welfare of our Church. It is the principle of *independency* in opposition to *unity;* or the principle of *dissolution* in opposition to *conservation*. The author of an "Address" on the subject of the division of this Diocese, plainly avows the principle, and contends for the right of a part of a diocese to form itself into a distinct diocese independently of the General Convention.* And the writer who occupies our columns to-day, more covertly† but not less really adopts the same principle, though with a view to a different application of it. He advocates the multiplication of bishops, the unavoidable effect of which would be to render the House of Bishops a popular body. But he has the sagacity to see that such a feature is practically inconsistent with the unity of the Church as now organized. He evidently writes under the conviction, which he cannot conceal either from himself or his readers, that his favorite theory of many bishops and small dioceses must be carried into effect at the expense of the unity of the Church, or the unity must be preserved at the expense of his theory. Thus we find him speaking of "independent bishops," and repeatedly of the "federation" and "confederation" of dioceses; in one place censuring the constitution as "unprimitive," and, in another, advocating without ceremony "a great departure from the principles on which our Church is organized."

Now we affirm, (we use the word merely in the synthetical mode of argument—not dogmatically but with much diffidence,) that the Church, in virtue alike of its organization and its divine constitution, utterly discards the principle of independency, and is bound to act, and ever has acted, on the principle of unity.

That such an obligation rests on every member of the Church, in virtue of its present organization, surely cannot be questioned. We doubt not that the body who formed the organization, or they who have acquiesced in it since its formation, have a *natural right* to dissolve it. The representatives of the several dioceses may declare, in General Convention, that the union is extinct, and that the several dioceses shall be placed henceforward on an independent footing. We doubt not the power of any one diocese, or any part of a diocese, or any private members of the Church, to act on the *natural right* of independency, and renounce the obligation imposed by the organization; and we can conceive of cases, such as unlawful terms of communion, in which such a course would be justifiable. But we contend that, as long as the organization exists, the preservation of it—the unity of the Church under it—is to be assumed as an axiom or first principle of all legislation. Before we can be thrown back on the natural right of independency, and make *it* the principle of legislation, we must renounce and dissolve the organization. Let the question be fairly proposed to the General Convention, or to the Church at large, "Do you wish your organization dissolved?" and the unanimous answer would be, "No." In proportion then to the reasonableness of our desire that the organization should be perpetuated, is the absurdity of every measure which impairs its stability, and *in proportion to the extent of our obligation to preserve the former, is the extent of our obligation to reject the latter*. Is it calculated to weaken our organization? This question presents a standard by which the wisdom of every proposed measure, *under* our organization, may be tried. If any think that the organization is hostile to the best interests of the Church, and tends to quench the spirit, and restrict the freedom, and mar the simplicity of its operations, then let them take *direct* means to effect its dissolution. But while we continue *one organized body* let us regard the preservation of this *oneness* as a fundamental principle, and let us not be guilty of the wretched inconsistency of passing enactments that militate against our first principles. We might admire, if not approve, the manly decision which would at once declare the organization a non-entity, but we should feel a mixture of sorrow and contempt for the puerile policy that would expose it to the shame of an imbecile and protracted suicide.

But what is this "organization?" Is it indeed nothing more than a "confederation," as our correspondent terms it, of several *independent* churches? And do we indeed, after all, owe our boasted Unity to a *voluntary confederation?* We are not among the number of those who push Church principles to an extreme, and unchurch other denominations for want of a regular ministry; but really we are not quite prepared to settle down upon the Congregationalist plan of a *voluntary consociation of churches*. We have ever supposed our organization (for we must leave the term "confederation" for Independents) to be an *effect flowing from the principle of unity in the Church of* God, and not the unity to be an effect of the organization.

We affirm then further, that the Church is bound, not in virtue of a supposed "confederation," but in virtue of its divine constitution, to preserve, as long as practicable, its unity under its present organization. We affirm that the original organization was not a compact or confederation entered into by three or more independent bishops, with their ministers and people, but was merely the outward development or manifestation of a unity previously existing. We read of "social compacts," and political "alliances," and "confederations" in the world, but such terms are utterly unknown to the Church. In the world, the *natural* state of men is a state of *independency*, and government is a voluntary compact, in which individuals reserve as much, and concede as little of their private right and liberty as is necessary to their mutual preservation. In the Church, on the other hand, the *constituted* state of men is a state of *unity*, and their *union*, wherever it is practicable, is an obligation growing out of the divine principle of unity. In the former the proper tendency is to individuality, and nothing but necessity justifies the arrest of this tendency by legislative interposition: in the latter, the obligatory tendency is to union, and nothing but a conflicting and greater obligation can justify the individual in opposing the operation of the law of unity by the exercise of independency.

The simple theory of the Church of Christ we take to be that it is one body, and hence it follows undeniably that there ought not to be in it *independent* sources of influence. The theories of *unity* and *independency* are wholly irreconcileable. We do not mean by this that the *natural right* of independency is extinguished. This right is inalienable, and in virtue of it we are all independent of one another, and at liberty to form our religious opinions on our responsibility to God alone. But in the Church of Christ this natural right of the individual exists in connection with an obligation not to maintain any opinion, or pursue any conduct which shall violate the unity of the whole. Hence when we say, that there is no independency in the Church, we mean merely, that the *natural right* must be exercised in conformity with the *acknowledged obligation:* that no one can be independent of the rest, but that all individual independencies must harmonize in a general unity. In this sense it is manifest that the Church knows nothing of independency; every instance of it being fatal to unity.

But were not the apostles independent of one another? We answer, No: they were clothed with *equal*, but not with *independent* powers. The error of the Romanists has been, not surely that they have advocated unity, but that they have made it consist in dependence on the See of Rome, maintaining the official superiority of St. Peter. We, on the other hand, maintain the equality in office of the apostles and their successors the bishops: but do we, therefore maintain their independency? If so, then adieu for ever to all visible unity; for it matters not whether you place the independency in the private member, the deacon, the presbyter, or the bishop; exist where it may, its existence is destructive of unity, and his faith in Episcopacy must be strong indeed, who imagines that there is any charm in the Episcopal office simply, to preserve us from the distractions of heresy and schism. Wherever there is unity there must be mutual co-dependence. If any cause arose in the apostolic or primitive age to threaten division, "the apostles and elders," and after them the bishops, "came together for to consider of the matter." (*Acts* xv.) The decision of such council was thenceforward a bond of union. If the apostles had supposed themselves *independent* as well as *equal*, why come together? Why not stand every one on his individuality, and exercise his independent influence? The fact that they did come together proves conclusively that they acknowledged themselves under obligation to a *union* or mutual *co-dependence;* and it shows the way which they took to manifest their unity to the world. The decision in such a case was, we contend, binding upon the whole; and no individual, be he bishop, priest, or deacon, had the right to reject it, unless he conscientiously believed it to be at variance with the word of God, which is, of course, with every individual, and in all cases, the final arbiter. The constituted and obligatory tendency is to abide by the decision; and nothing but a conscientious belief of its anti-scriptural character could justify an opposition to the constituted obligation of unity by a resumption of the naked natural right of independency.

That this principle was acted on in the early ages of the Church; that in conformity with it general councils were called; that to these councils we are indebted for the best extra-scriptural summaries of our faith; that these summaries were regarded as expressing the united sense of the Catholic Church; that they were acknowledged as obligatory on the faithful, unless any, on his responsibility to God, set them aside as repugnant to the ultimate standard of the Scriptures, to which all had the right of reference; and that it was *in this way* and not by the independent exercise of Episcopal functions, that the unity of the Church was preserved, will hardly be denied, we suppose, by any members of our Church. And these precedents are memorable, not simply from the invaluable results which flowed from them, but as proving it to be the abiding conviction of the primitive Church, that they were bound, as far as practicable, to carry out the *principle* of *unity* into the *law* of *union*, and to grow up, to the extent of their ability, in one body, knit together in mutual dependency, by a common faith and common usages.

Let us glance for a moment at later times. At the time of the Reformation, the Church of England proceeded on a different principle from any others. The English Reformers acted on the principle of *conservation* or *unity*, others on the principle of *independency*. The Church of England presented the spectacle of a branch of the Christian Church collectively reforming itself: the Reformation elsewhere presented the spectacle of individuals, either separately or jointly, either lay or clerical, as the case might be, standing on their natural right of independency, apart from, and in opposition to the Church, and protesting against her encroachments. Whether the latter were right or wrong, and whether their ecclesiastical acts were justifiable and valid, is a question foreign to the subject. We are now stating facts and not discussing theories; and the fact is unquestioned that the Church of England reformed on the *conservative* and not on the *independent* principle. We are told by Villiers, in his admirable essay on the Lutheran Reformation, and the sentiment has been re-echoed by Benjamin Constance and Dr. Channing, and all the Unitarian writers, (aye, and Romanist writers too, who fraternize with their antipodes in more things than one,) that if Protestants would consistently push out the principle of the Reformation, they would give up their creeds, confessions, consociations and churches, and resolve themselves into their individual elements. This may be true of other Protestants, but it is not true of the Church of England. For the Church of England reformed *unitedly* and on the *Christian right* of church authority, and not as did others *independently*, and on the *natural right* of private judgment. She recognised the right of private judgment in her members, renounced the usurpations which had fettered it, gave the people the Bible, and invited them to judge by it her liturgy and articles, her worship, discipline and doctrines. The recognition of this right was part of her reformation, was the means she took to save her members from the necessity of acting on the natural right of independency, in opposition to the corruptions of Rome. But did she herein act herself on the principle of independency? Did she consider herself independent and under no obligation to remain in the unity, or respect the sense of the Catholic Church? So far from it, that she transferred the creeds of the primitive Church to her Prayer-book, she retained ancient usages in her ritual, she compared the sense of the Catholic Church anew with the Scriptures, and embodied the result in her articles, her doctrines and worship, enjoining them on her members as obligatory, unless set aside by the individual on the plea of conscience, sustained by an appeal to Revelation, the final arbiter. She thus, as far as practicable, acknowledged her dependence on the Catholic Church, and preserved her unity with it. It was her just boast that she blended in one the sense of the Catholic Church and the sense of the Scriptures. She was as ready to meet the Romanist in an appeal to the former, as to meet the Dissenter in an appeal to the latter. In prosecuting the Reformation she considered herself under obligation to preserve the unity of the Catholic Church, and adhere to the sense of it, so far as she believed it to be authorized by God's Word. She rejected the figment of the *infallibility* of councils, but she respected the decisions of councils whenever they were such as to express the sense of the Church. And her divines have uniformly declared that they rejected the Council of Trent, not from a disrespect to the sense of the Catholic Church, but because the Council of Trent could at best but indicate the sense of the Church in one age, and was in fact no index even of that, being no better than a packed council—the mere creature of the Pope—so notoriously under the influence of Rome, and in such open negotiation with it, as justly to have incurred the biting sarcasm of the illustrious historian Father Paul, (himself a Romanist,) that "answers were brought from the Pope, as from the Oracle of Delphos or Dodona, and that the Holy Ghost was sent from Rome daily in a postillion's cloak-bag."

In conducting the Reformation, then, the Church of England as a body knew nothing of the principle of independency. She neither was nor aimed to be independent of the Catholic Church, but reformed under a solemn sense of obligation to preserve the unity of the Church.

And on what principle did the bishops of the Church of England act in their individual capacities during and subsequently to the Reformation? Unquestionably they were invested as bishops with *equal* powers, but did they thence consider themselves invested with *independent* powers? Has any one of them, from the time of the Reformation to the present, ever considered himself at liberty, in virtue of his Episcopal powers, to act independently of the rest, and erect an independent centre of influence? No: and why not? Because conformity was the law of the land? And have the bishops of the Church of England then clung to her as the mere creature of the Establishment? No Churchman, we presume, will attribute to them so unworthy motives. All will admit that they have conformed to the Church, not as a civil but as a divine institution; that they have adopted the liturgy and articles, the doctrines, discipline and worship of the Church as organized in Great Britain, not on the ground of voluntary confederation, but on the ground of an obligation to union flowing from the very essence of church unity. No one bishop, no number of bishops have ever dreamed that they were independent of their peers, and had the right to withdraw from the existing organization and act independently of their brethren. They have ever felt that the principle of Catholic unity rendered it binding on them, while in England, to conform to the Church as there organized; there being nothing in the organization, in their judgment, at variance with the word of God.

And how was it in our own country at the close of the revolutionary war? Our bishops undoubtedly were *equal*, clothed with *equal* powers and rights. But did they therefore consider themselves *independent?* Did they come together like three independent princes, and enter into a voluntary "alliance" or "confederation?" So far was this from being the case, that there was a sacrifice of individual wishes and predilections, and even on some important points a concession of opinions, before a union could be effected. We confess we cannot see why they should not have indulged their several tastes; why they should not have proceeded every one upon his own foundation, unless they had been impressed with a sense of the obligation to union growing out of Christian unity. They felt themselves not induced by social sympathies and interests to form a voluntary "confederation" or an "alliance" offensive and defensive, but obligated by the principle of Christian unity to merge their individual rights and powers in a mutual co-dependence. The result was the *organization* of the Church as now existing. And it follows that the organization itself is not of the nature of a compact or alliance, but rather a specific shape or form given to the prior and immutable principle of Church unity. Of course, then, the obligation to conform to the organization is the same as to preserve Christian unity. Secession against the will of the General Convention, is justifiable only in the event of unlawful terms of communion, and in those extreme cases which impel us to the exercise of the naked right of independency in disconnection from the obligation of unity. If the political union of the States were to be severed, or any impassable barrier to ecclesiastical union were to be interposed, then of course the obligation of Christian unity could not be so fully carried into effect; the present organization would be dissolved, and the sectional divisions of the Church would be placed in a state not of real but comparative independence. But nothing short of that, so far as we can see, can prevent the present organization from continuing to bind us together with all the force of Christian unity.

It is the nature of man to be insensible to his blessings, and it is emphatically true that the blessings of a good constitution, whether in church or state, are seldom fully understood and worthily appreciated until they are forfeited. It is easy for a man to say that he does not approve of this or that feature in our organization; but it should be remembered that this fabric, as every similar one, has been the result of long time and matured wisdom; that it may be easily disordered and ruined by vicious legislation, but with difficulty repaired and restored. It may be that our organization will bear to be studied, and that a patient investigation of it will result in the discovery of excellences that do not lie on the surface. They who frame an organization are generally men who have surveyed the past, and have a deep forecast of the future, and have, as will be found in a majority of instances, anticipated, weighed and overruled the objections of those who would seek to mend their work. We do not accuse our correspondent of precipitancy in expressing himself dissatisfied with the principles of our organization — how can we, when he assures us that he speaks after "five years'" anxious deliberation? — but we rather commend his *tardiness* in avowing his dissatisfaction as an example worthy of all imitation. And we are sure that he will agree with us that it is a safe and sound principle in all legislation to study the spirit and genius of the constitution, and *carry out into action the principles which it actually contains*, be they what they may. To question the correctness of these principles on merely speculative grounds, and to legislate in repugnance to their spirit, savors of empiricism. It is the part of sound, practical wisdom to adhere to them faithfully and carry them out consistently as long as they exist, and when they are found to have failed, then, and not before, to censure and abandon them.

That these views have a direct bearing on the question of few or many bishops can hardly be doubted. For we suppose it to be manifest, on the most superficial inspection, that the structure of our ecclesiastical constitution contemplates that the House of Bishops should not be a popular body, and we suppose it to be equally manifest to every man that knows any thing of human nature, that the conversion of it into a popular body would render it not as now the barrier to the evils of innovation and popular excitement, but the very harbinger of distractions and dissolution. We are told that to have small dioceses was a feature of the primitive Church. True; but we must remember that it is our privilege to possess, not one feature only, but the catholic sense and usage generally of the primitive Church. The fathers who formed our present organization would have taken too narrow a view had they fixed their attention on a single feature of the primitive Church. They appear rather to have regarded the faith, discipline, and worship of the catholic Church in their purity and integrity as the boon which they were intrusted solicitously to guard and transmit to their children. That they framed the constitution of the Church with a view to this end, and that the *senatorial* character of the House of Bishops is necessary to preserve the balance of the constitution, will hardly be questioned, and as little can it be questioned that a system of legislation which shall tend to deprive the House of Bishops of its *senatorial* character and reduce it to the level of a popular body, would be an effectual way to defeat their work. Thus far the Church has wisely acted out, in this respect, the spirit of its constitution, even to the neglect or violation of primitive usage. It had been primitive, for instance, to send out bishops into our western country to form and organize churches, but instead of adopting this primitive usage, we have required as large a number of presbyters as the exigencies of the country would justify as indispensable to the possession of a bishop. Thus we have hitherto designedly guarded against the unnecessary multiplication of bishops. The proximate cause of this policy has been doubtless to preserve the wisdom and dignity of the House of Bishops. But there has also been behind this a more remote, more recondite, and more weighty cause which seems hitherto to have been tacitly assumed as the basis of our ecclesiastical organization. At this cause we have already glanced, and we go now briefly to develope it.

The common saying is, *Truth is mighty and will prevail;* and for the common affairs of life the maxim may hold good; but in its application to moral truth generally, and especially to the truth of the Bible, we take it to be utterly unsound and fallacious. It is demonstrably fallacious in theory, and notoriously so in fact. It is manifest, *a priori*, that so sure as human nature is corrupt, and the truth of the Bible opposed to its corruption, so sure must the truth of the Bible, when left to work its own way, run out into infidelity. And that this obvious dictate of reason has been verified in fact, is abundantly manifested by the whole experience of the Christian world. Has it not been found necessary in all ages to fortify the truths of the Bible by the outworks of liturgies, creeds, confessions, or articles? Has the Bible ever existed for any length of time without these bulwarks, among any people, without being shorn of its distinguishing doctrines, and brought down by them to the level of their own tastes? Could any other result be expected from the acknowledged corruption of human nature, has any other been realized by the experience of the Christian Church? Has not the Church, as well Protestant as Romanist, as well Presbyterian as Episcopal, ever regarded the word of God as a sacred *deposit*, which it was to *guard* as well as *dispense?* Is there a Church in existence which has been unfaithful in this respect to its trust, disregarded these bulwarks, and left the Bible to itself, without having its orthodoxy impaired and its light extinguished? Has not the contest for moral truth ever been the struggle of the few against the many; and has it not been the constant aim, even in civil governments, to make the corruption of human nature the implied basis of legislature, and secure the wisdom and dignity of the few as an antidote to the rashness and mobility of the many? Our correspondent, we think, hazards a light remark, when he speaks of the "subintroduced character of *counsellor* in the Confederacy." We have, indeed, much to learn, if the character of counsellor is not an essential feature in the Christian bishop; and warm as is our attachment to Episcopacy—strong as is our faith that God will bless his own ordinance—we shall yet surrender all hopes of retaining the purity of the Church, when the wisdom of the counsellor is extinguished in the activity of the diocesan, and when the General Convention shall find in its House of Bishops a large, excitable, and tumultuous assemblage, instead of a select, calm, and deliberative body. It is not the Episcopacy only; it is not the insulated office of a bishop, and the bare fact of a ministry in three orders, at which we are to look; but we are rather to consider the Episcopacy as a part of an entire system, as subordinate to the preservation of the mysterious and distinguishing truths of the Bible, and as fitted to cherish in the present generation, and to transmit to the future, the sense of the Catholic Church. At the time of our organization we received from the mother Church not the Episcopacy only, but the pure doctrines of the Gospel, the liturgy, the usages, the habits of mind, the religious feelings, and, be it especially observed, not bishops only, but a *veneration for the office and authority of bishops*. All these excellences are interwoven with the existence of the Church; and our fathers, in framing our constitution, have aimed to transmit them to posterity in their entireness. We are told that the dioceses in England are too large: doubtless there is some truth in the remark, and doubtless there are defects in the English Church. But with all its defects, it has been confessedly the glorious bulwark of the Reformation; and if it be found that the dignity of the office of bishops, and the paucity of their number have been among the causes of the stability of that Church, let us beware how we make that office cheap and frequent. It has been the glory of the Church of England to have cherished in mutual fellowship the Scriptures and the sense of the Catholic Church, with its spirit and usages. And the General Convention of our Church should consider itself the depository of the same sacred trust, and feel the solemn responsibility of being pledged to preserve these blessings for their country and the world. If bishops can do this, alone and independently, in virtue of any excellence in the Episcopal office, considered abstractedly and *per se*, better disband the General Convention at once, leave the Church at sixes and sevens, and let the bishops act in their fancied independence, and form their "alliances," and "confederacies" according to the whim and caprice of the day. But independent bishops cannot do it, for the simple reason that the Church knows no such thing as independent bishops. There is no more security for preserving the integrity of scriptural truth by means of independent bishops, than by means of independent presbyters, or independent laymen. There is no reason to expect such a result on the principles of human nature, and, if independency is unknown in the Church of God, there is no reason to expect it on the ground of scriptural promise. To open the way for such a state of things, as we infallibly should by the unnecessary multiplication of bishops, is to act counter to the known principles of human nature and the genius of the Christian Church—to throw away the wisdom of the past and prepare for a repetition of events similar to the disputes and tumultuous councils of former ages. We have now the truth of God's Word in its integrity; we have the Bible, not as frittered away by the nibblings of a shoal of independent speculatists, but as guarded by the collective sense of the catholic Church; and we have in our communion those habits of practical piety and that kind of personal religion which have been formed under the united influence of the Bible and the Church, as transmitted to us by the mother Church, and secured by our present organization. And these blessings in their wholeness, and not Episcopacy only, which is but one of them, we are charged, in our turn, to transmit to others: let us feel the sacredness of this trust; let us appreciate the worth of these blessings before they are lost, and let us beware how we depart, either in *spirit* or *letter*, from a constitution which was framed with an express view to conserve and perpetuate them.

---

* We quoted from memory, not having the pamphlet at hand, but on reading the proof sheet it occurs to us that we should have said, the right of each diocese to divide itself.

† We use the word in no invidious sense, and would have preferred to say *implicitly*, if this word were now received in its primitive acceptation.

That there are minor objections to the course we advocate we allow, but none, we are persuaded, which will have weight with a matured and enlarged judgment. We hear much of the "ambition" inspired by the office. But what good is there without its alloy of evil? And if the office is to be so cheapened as not to be considered by weak minds an object of ambition, what will it be good for? What efficiency, what respectability, what weight of authority will it have? More is said on this point, however, than is just. In the first place it generally happens that by the time a man is fit for an office in the public estimation, he has learned to judge of things by a different standard, and has lost whatever ambition for the office he might once have had: in the second place, it should be the aim to elevate the clerical character to the real dignity of the office, and not degrade the office to a supposed indignity in the clerical character; and in the third place, it is the tendency of things, and of the episcopal office among others, to degenerate in public estimation; and as the tendency will develope itself fast enough without our help, so it should be our aim, by legislation, to restrain and not accelerate its progress. As to efficient episcopal supervision, we admit it must be had: but let us beware that in securing one blessing we do not forfeit another. We speak of a bishop's efficiency as if it consisted exclusively in active duty and frequent visitations; but this surely is a superficial view of the subject, though one which the present state of our country inclines us to take, and one on which for that reason we may lay an undue stress. A bishop should bring to his office wisdom of counsel, and weight of authority, and he should command that respectful deference which is spontaneously accorded to sterling worth, and which, when accorded, has proved a powerful means of cherishing among men a sense of religion and an attachment to the Church. The Church, it should be remembered, as well as every thing else, may outgrow its strength: and if *many* bishops are better calculated to facilitate its rapid extension, *few* bishops will tend more to insure its permanent stability. With all our wisdom and caution we may be unable to retain the blessings we possess; but by indiscreet legislation, by looking too exclusively at the present and being more imbued with the spirit of the age than with the sense of the universal Church, we may needlessly throw away the blessings we have: we may grasp at the shadow and lose the substance; and, worse than all, we may prove, from a culpable imbecility, unfaithful to the high trust reposed in us by the Head of the Church, and fail to transmit to our children, in its unsullied integrity, the sacred deposit which we have received at the hand of our fathers.

It is on such grounds that we are cordially and wholly with the writer in the Protestant Episcopalian, and decidedly against our present correspondent in their respective details. May the Holy Spirit be with the Convention, to enlighten their minds and guide their counsels!

P. S. We have been obliged to write while the article of our correspondent is in the hand of the compositor, and desire to be understood as having only a general reference to his theory and arguments. Something we wished to say, but we have not room, on the writer's view of a small deliberative body, such as the House of Bishops is designed to be, presenting no better guarantee for sound legislation than a large one. We are the more willing, however, to let the view pass, as we suppose it will find little credence among practical men.

We sincerely sympathise with Mr. Moore in his recent loss, and commend his card to the special attention of our readers.

Coit's Apocrypha.—The Apocryphal Books have been edited by Dr. Coit on the same plan with his edition of the Bible. It is accompanied with a preface respecting the use and character of the Apocrypha, an introduction to the several books, brief notes and copious references, and arranged, of course, in paragraphs and parallelisms. Those who have been pleased with Dr. Coit's edition of the Bible will be equally pleased with the execution of the present work.

GENERAL CONVENTION.

Philadelphia, August 19, 1835.

This being the day appointed for the meeting of the *General Convention* of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, the members thereof assembled in St. Peter's Church in this city. The church was filled with a highly respectable and gratified auditory. The morning prayer was read by the Rev. Dr. Wyatt, of Maryland, and the Rev. Dr. Burroughs, of New Hampshire; the epistles and gospels by our venerable and apostolic Senior Bishop, whose voice, at the advanced age of nearly fourscore and ten, was so strong and distinct as to be heard without difficulty at the extreme end of the church. The sermon was delivered by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Stone, of Maryland. After the celebration of the holy communion, in which I observed with great satisfaction almost every male present participated, the House was called to order by the Rev. Dr. Mead, of Philadelphia, and on motion, the Rev. Dr. Wyatt, of Baltimore, was appointed President pro tem., and the Rev. Dr. Anthon, of New-York, Secretary pro tem.

The members of the House of Bishops are all in attendance, except the venerable Bishop of the Eastern Diocese and the Assistant Bishop of Virginia. It was indeed a goodly sight to see no less than *fourteen* Prelates, preceded by the venerable Senior Bishop, pass from the vestry-room through the middle aisle to the chancel at the other end of the church. It is but a *few*, very *few* years, comparatively, that the House of Bishops consisted of but two or three members. How changed the condition and prospects of the Church in our country! Blessed be God for the abundant prosperity, both temporally and spiritually, which it hath pleased him to vouchsafe to our branch of the primitive and apostolic Church. May that prosperity continue until every hamlet in our widely-extended country shall be blessed with the ministrations of the pious ministers who serve at her altars, is the devout prayer of

Yours truly,
F**** S****.

Sunday School Report.—We have received the ninth annual report of the Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union. Its statements show satisfactorily that the cause of Sunday school instruction, *in connexion with the Sunday School Union*, is gaining an increasing hold on the good opinions and affections of the Church. We shall take further notice of the report in our next.

Liberal Religion.—Readers who are not in the habit of looking at the "Poet's Corner" will be pleased with the parody—if we may call it so—on our last page. It appeared in a New-England paper, and is, we believe, from the pen of a clergyman of our Church.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

It was found inconsistent with previous arrangements to insert S. L. T.

A. in our next: we have no objection to insert his proposed series.

When we promised, in our last, to advert again to the Temperance Society, we did not expect the communication of "An Episcopalian." The length of his article, (together with our own strictures,) and the necessity of its appearing this week, has compelled us to defer to another week "A Friend to Temperance Societies." Since our last, too, we have seen the Episcopal Recorder, of August 1, in reply to Bishop Hopkins, which we did not see in regular course. In order that both sides of the argument may be seen, we have handed that article to the printer. It is now in type and shall appear, with brief comments designed as a candid statement of the argument, in our next. "G. B." on the same subject is received.

The Latin letter, from Denmark, on the subject of the Danish Episcopacy, is received.

KENTUCKY CONVENTION.

We have received the Journal of the Kentucky Convention, and as it is short, shall give it to the reader entire. The address of the Bishop will be found on the last page.

The stated annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Kentucky, met on the 11th day of June, 1835: present, the Rev. A. Cleaver, the Rev. Daniel H. Deacon, and the Rev. Henry Caswall.

The Rev. A. Cleaver was elected president pro tempore, and the Rev. H. Deacon, secretary pro tem.

After morning service, the Bishop being absent, the Convention adjourned until next day, according to the provision made in the Constitution.

Friday, June 12.

The Convention assembled according to adjournment; present, the Rev. David C. Page, the Rev. A. Cleaver, Rev. D. H. Deacon, Rev. H. Caswall. The Rev. D. C. Page was elected President, and read prayers; after which the Convention proceeded to business.

Mr. James Arnold presented his credentials as delegate from the parish of St. Peter's, Paris; and John E. Cooke, from Christ Church, Lexington. The latter was appointed Secretary of the Convention.

On motion, the Rules of Order of the last Convention were adopted.

The Secretary then presented to the President the Bishop's Address, forwarded from New-York, where, and in other cities of the East, he has been for some time, at the request of the Standing Committee, for the purpose of obtaining aid for the Theological Seminary. The address was read by the President.

On motion, it was resolved, that a committee be appointed to receive the parochial reports, and the Rev. Mr. Cleaver, Rev. Mr. Caswall and John E. Cooke, were named as the Committee by the President.

On motion, resolved, that a committee on unfinished business be appointed, and the Rev. D. H. Deacon and Mr. Arnold were named by the President.

The Convention then proceeded to the election of the Standing Committee for the ensuing year, and the Rev. Messrs. Page, Cleaver and Adams, and of the Laity, Mr. A. K. Smedes and John E. Cooke, were elected by ballot.

The President, in the name of the Bishop, and according to instructions received from him through the Secretary, then nominated the same persons as Trustees of the Theological Seminary for the ensuing year; and on motion, the Convention approved the nomination.

The Convention then proceeded to the election of delegates to the General Convention. On the first ballot, the Rev. Mr. Page and the Rev. Mr. Giddinge; and of the laity, Richard Barnes, Thomas Towles and John E. Cooke, were elected: on the second, the Rev. Mr. Cleaver was added; on the third, there was not a majority for any one person.

On motion, the Convention then adjourned to attend Divine service; to meet again at 5 o'clock, at the close of the evening service.

Five o'clock, P. M.

The Convention met according to adjournment. Mr. Frederick Yeiser appeared as delegate from Trinity Church, Danville, and took his seat.

The Convention then proceeded to the election of a clerical and a lay delegate to the General Convention; and the Rev. D. H. Deacon and Mr. G. W. Anderson, were chosen.

On motion, adjourned until 9 o'clock in the morning.

June 13, nine o'clock.

After prayers the Convention proceeded to business. Present, all the members above named.

The Committee on Unfinished Business, reported nothing found unfinished.

The Committee on Parochial Reports, presented a report from the Rev. Messrs. Page, Cleaver, Deacon, Adams and Caswall.

On motion, they were then read by the Secretary, as follows:—

Report of the Rev. D. C. Page, Rector of Christ Church, Louisville.

During the past year the Rector has performed 11 marriages, 30 burials, and 23 baptisms, of which 7 were adult. Present number of communicants 111. Since the last Convention, there has been, allowing for deaths and removals, a considerable increase in the number of communicants, and a demand for pews, which the wardens have found it impossible to meet. The congregations have been more uniformly large, than at any former period; and never was there so bright a prospect for the extension of the Church in this community, as there is at the present moment. The Sunday school is in a flourishing condition, and is at present—this arrangement having been suggested by the late zealous and efficient Intendant, Mr. Jacob Reinhard—under the immediate direction of the Rev. B. O. Peers. "The weekly offerings" have been revived with happy effect, and a commendable readiness has been evinced by the congregation for every good and charitable work. It is believed by the Rector, that there are but few parishes in the country where there are finer materials for the erection of an elevated standard of Christian liberality, and Christian sentiment in general, than that which Divine providence has committed to his charge; and he cherishes the hope that the day is not very far distant when his beloved people will be behind none in the land, in an intelligent and self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of it, and the institutions of the Church.

D. C. Page, *Rector.*

Report of the Rev. John A. Adams, Rector of Trinity Church, Danville.

Communicants last reported 24; do. removed by death 2; added 2; present number 24; baptisms, (one adult, one infant,) 2; funerals 5; marriages 1; sabbath school teachers 5; Children about 20.

John Alex. Adams, *Rector.*

Report of the Rev. D. H. Deacon, Rector of St. Paul's Parish, Henderson.

Present number of communicants 7; confirmed 3; baptized (children) 15; death one. The present prospects of the parish are encouraging. Had we a church built, most of our difficulties would be removed.

D. H. Deacon, *Rector.*

Report of the Rev. H. Caswall, Assistant Minister of Christ Church, Lexington.

The Assistant Minister reports that since the last Convention, he has solemnized two marriages, and officiated at two funerals. During the past winter, the congregations have been generally small, on account of the severity of the weather. At present, however, the attendance is about the same as usual. The Wednesday evening lectures have been well attended. The number of scholars in the Sunday school has somewhat diminished—seldom exceeding sixty.

H. Caswall.

Report of the Rev. Amos Cleaver, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Paris.

Since last Convention, there has been one baptism of an adult lady, two funerals, and six marriages. The Sunday school still consists of about eight or ten scholars. I have made considerable efforts to increase the number of pupils, but without success. I live in hope, however, that parents will by-and-by see the importance of Sunday school instruction, and urge it upon their children to attend. I have to mourn in silence the want of parents' co-operation: till this is vigorous, I cannot hope to do much. May God impress them with its necessity! Whether any thing has been done to the souls of my fellow men that shall be accounted at the day of Christ, I cannot say;—this thing lies closest to my heart. The building of the Church is a matter of anxious thought, but compared with doing good to men's souls, is not worth consideration. It is, however, a cheering circumstance, that I am not altogether without evidence of having done a little, or rather the grace of God by me. Some persons are evidently very seriously concerned about spiritual things; may it issue in their union with the Church here and hereafter.

Amos Cleaver, *Rector,*

On motion, it was resolved unanimously, that every clergyman in the Diocese be urged to make weekly collections from every communicant, of such sums as they may be willing to contribute, for the purposes of the Diocese.

On motion, adjourned to attend Divine service; to meet after the evening service.

Five o'clock, P. M.

The Convention met according to adjournment.

On motion, resolved that the next Convention meet at Louisville.

On motion, resolved that 500 copies of the Journal be printed.

On motion, the Convention adjourned *sine die.*

John E. Cooke, *Secretary of Convention.*

INTELLIGENCE.

BISHOP BROWNELL'S VISITATION.

The Right Rev. Bishop Brownell purposes, by Divine permission, to visit the following parishes during the month of September.

Sunday, September 13, Warehouse Point, East Windsor; 16, Waterbury, service at half past 10 o'clock, A. M.; 18, St. Peter's, Plymouth, 2, P. M.; 19, Wolcot, 2, P. M.; 20, Salem Bridge; 21, Woodbury, 2, P. M.; 22, Roxbury, 2, P. M.; 23, Bethlehem, 2, P. M.; 24, Northfield, 2, P. M.; 25, Milton, 2, P. M.; 26, Bradleyville, 11, A. M.; 27, Lichfield, 10, A. M.; —, Watertown 3, P. M.

Ordination.—At a Special Ordination, held by the Right Rev. Dr. Brownell, in Christ Church, Hartford, on the 11th of August, the Rev. Joseph Tyler, and the Rev. John Rouse, were admitted to the Holy Order of Priests, and Mr. E. E. Beardsley, late a tutor in Washington College, was admitted to the Order of Deacons.

On this occasion Divine service was read by the Rev. Mr. Burges, and an address was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Wheaton.

Ordination.—We learn that at St. John's Church, Broad Creek Parish, Md., on Sunday the 12th of July, the Rev. John Woart was admitted to the holy order of Priests, by the Right Rev. Bishop Stone. The candidate was presented by the Rev. E. R. Lippitt, of the Theological Seminary of Virginia. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Charles W. Dana, Rector of Christ Church, Alexandria. The Bishop confirmed twenty persons in this church on the same day. Preparation had been made for the reception of the Bishop by the painting of the interior of the church, and improvements about the chancel and pulpit.—*Episcopal Recorder.*

Geneva College.—The annual commencement of this institution took place on Wednesday the 5th instant, and the exercises were throughout highly interesting and creditable to those concerned. The number of graduates was three, but not having the proceedings of the Boards of Faculty and Trustees, we are unable to give the names of those who received the degree of A. M. in course. The honorary degree of A. M. was conferred upon Mr. D. E. Burhans, teacher of the academy at Manlius, N. Y. The address before the Alumni of the College by the Rev. H. Gregory, A. M., was interesting, tender and appropriate, and we trust extensively useful. The address before the Philological Society, by the senior tutor, G. T. Thompson, and that of the Rev. Gustavus Abeel, before the Euglossian and Alpha Phi Delta Societies, which we were unable to hear, are spoken of as evincing strong talent on the part of the speakers, and affording high gratification to the audience.—*(Auburn) Gospel Mess.*

The Rev. Parker Adams.—This pious and faithful minister of Christ died some months since in Florida, to which Territory he had gone for the benefit of his health. We have waited for some of the particulars of his life, as well as of his departure, but as we have not yet been able to converse with the reverend brother who was with him in the closing weeks of his life, and as we have not yet been favored with any details or dates, we can do no more at present, than to remind our readers that Mr. Adams was for many years a clergyman of this diocese, and for a number of years before his death was Rector of St. Stephen's Church, New-Hartford, Oneida county, where he was as warmly as deservedly loved. We sympathise with his widow and children, as from whom God in his providence has taken not only their supporter, companion and guide, but our highly valuable and long tried friend. His manners, always humble, modest and devout, were admired by all who knew him.

His fidelity to the Church of his choice was well known, and as the sinner's instructer and the sad one's soother and counsellor, there are very many to revere his memory. He was the friend and warm supporter, with unvarying accuracy and punctuality, of our humble labors in this publication, as well as in a former case of similar exertion, and we shall never forget the affection and kindness with which he encouraged and cheered us in those days of despondency, when the stones of our sanctuary lay in the ashes after the fire had consumed our earthly dwelling of the Lord of Hosts. Nor was his the mere expression of tender and soothing words, as we went on the humiliating errand of solicitation. His own *hand* was liberally opened, while his flock heard our statement and extended their gifts. And after that we saw him no more. May God sanctify the loss.—*(Auburn) Gospel Messenger.*

Massachusetts. — The Annual Convention of the Church in this State was held at Pittsfield on the 17th and 18th days of June last. The number of clergymen belonging to the State is 36. The number present on the opening of the Convention, besides the Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, who of course presided, was fourteen, and among the visiters was the Bishop of Kentucky. Fifteen congregations were represented by laity. The tabular view of the parochial reports gives the following results; baptisms, infants 259, adults 62. Communicants, died or removed, 203; added, 250; present number, 1783. Confirmations, 183. Sunday school scholars, 1932. Bible classes, 8, having 216 members. Missionary collections, $1,242 01.

Michigan.—The Second Annual Convention of this Diocese met at Tecumseh, on the 13th of June last. It would appear, from the Journal now before us, that ten clergymen were, at the time of the Convention, regarded as having their canonical residence in the Territory. Five only were present. There were present twenty-one lay deputies, representing six congregations.

The Rev. J. P. Bausman was elected President, and C. C. Trowbridge, Esq., Secretary.

The parochial reports are, of course, little more than the history of the commencement of newly organized congregations. They show, however, an encouraging prospect of onward progress.

At this Convention the Rev. H. J. Whitehouse, D. D., Rector of St. Luke's Church, Rochester, was elected Bishop of the Diocese. He has, as we are assured, declined the appointment.

Translation of the Prayer-book.—It will gratify our readers to learn that this book, prized by us all as next in sacred character to the Gospel of the Saviour, is about to be translated into the various languages spoken in India, in the extensive empire of Russia, and throughout the whole Grecian Archipelago. It appears from a recent report made to the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, that *definitive* arrangements for this purpose have been already entered into by a committee of that Society. Specimens of the new Arabic version of the Prayer-book, made by a learned native of Bagdad, and of the new version in the Dutch language, were submitted by the same committee.

Thrilling Incident.—While the cars were in full movement on the Germantown rail road on Sunday, an object was descried a-head, which, on approaching and arresting the locomotive, was found to be a child asleep. Its arm and head were resting on the rail, "taking its nap," says the Philadelphia Gazette, "on this perilous pillow, after being fatigued, probably, by play."—*Trans.*

Protestant Episcopal Church in Jerusalem.—It is well known, that, for ages, various branches of the Christian Church have had their convents and their places of worship in Jerusalem. The Greek, the Roman Catholic, the Armenian, each can find brethren to receive him, and a house of prayer in which to worship. In Jerusalem, the Turk also has his mosque and the Jew his synagogue. The pure Christianity of the Reformation alone appears as a stranger: some of its professors have been seen there as travellers or antiquarians; and, within the last few years, as preachers of the Gospel; but the pure form of its worship has never yet been exhibited in all its simple majesty, so as practically to instruct the Jew, the Mahomedan, or the corrupt Christian.

The vast importance of a place of public worship in such a city, where a large Jewish congregation constantly resides, and which is visited by devout Jews and Christians from every part of the world, must be felt by all who consider the effect which our public services in this country produce on the mass of the population. Many a one, from curiosity or some other similar motive, enters the house of prayer, and sees and hears what is made effectual to his soul's salvation.

Such place of worship at Jerusalem would do more to attract the attention of devout Jews and to remove their prejudices, than the solitary declarations of isolated missionaries. The prejudice of the Jews is against Christianity as a system, as a form of worship; and the only way whereby this prejudice can be overcome generally, is by exhibiting Christian worship in its purity. The Liturgy in Hebrew would tend to remove the other part of the prejudice, that Christianity is a Gentile system, and, as such, must be at once rejected. Of course, it is not meant that these means will, of themselves, convert a single soul: but it is hoped, that, as they are scriptural, and agreeable to the spirit of St. Paul, who to the Jews became a Jew that he might win the Jews, that they will have God's blessing, and thus be rendered effectual in rousing the attention of the Jewish nation.

Some friends of the London Society, to whom these thoughts have been communicated, have been so impressed with their importance, that they have at once entered into liberal subscriptions to erect or prepare a Hebrew Church in Jerusalem. Several letters on the subject have been addressed to the Committee; who have, in consequence, determined, if it please God, to open a place of worship in the Holy City, according to the forms and Liturgy of the Church of England. The plan would be, to have public worship, as the Jews have in their Synagogue, every morning and evening through the week, in Hebrew; and, on Sunday, to have the same service in Italian, English, or Modern Greek, so as not altogether to exclude Christians from the benefit of the Service.—*Circular of the London Jews' Society.*

Meetings of Religious Societies.—We should have been glad, had space been left, to have devoted a few pages to the late meetings of the religious Societies, which have been numerous, interesting, and well attended, beyond example. With no feeble delight and gratitude do we find the income of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge rising to 91,092*l.*, and its distribution of Bibles, Prayer Books, and other books and tracts, to 2,278,048; that of the Church Missionary Society rising to 69,582*l.*, and its stations and operations increasing every year in number and efficiency; the Naval and Military Bible Society circulating 12,958 copies of the Scriptures among our soldiers and seamen; the Society for the Conversion of the Jews augmenting its resources to 12,328*l.*, being a rise of one-fifth of its last year's income; the London Missionary Society, with eight hundred missionaries, teachers, and schoolmasters, and receipts amounting to 57,895*l.*; the Prayer Book and Homily Society, with its translations in numerous languages, and its issues during the year of 13,247 bound books, and 81,260 tracts from our venerated Formularies; the Hibernian Society, with 1945 schools and 114,486 scholars; the Temperance Society issuing 3,832,800 tracts: the Religious Tract Society issuing during the year 16,241,349 copies of its publications, making a total of 215,000,000, in eighty languages, since its commencement; the Bible Society—but for that see the statement appended to our present number. We notice only those whose recent papers happen at the moment to be in our hands, meaning no disparagement to others; and we cannot thus briefly condense the labors of various excellent institutions—such as the Lord's Day Society, the District Visiting Society, &c. Yet it is not the mere amount of funds and operations that we rejoice in; but rather in the increased activity, harmony, spirituality, and, by the blessing of God, the unspeakably beneficial results of these and similar institutions. To Him be the glory.*—*(London) Christian Observer.*

The Oriental Translation Fund Committee are proceeding in their labors with great spirit. Foreign scholars are entering into the design with becoming zeal. The translation of a part of Makrizi's History of Egypt, commencing with the fall of the descendants of Saladin, has been undertaken by M. Quatremere. The Khatai Nameh, translated from the Turkish, by Pros. Fleischer, is a curious description of the empire of China. A desideratum, which has long been felt by oriental scholars, it is hoped, will be supplied by means of Mr. Gyangoz, of Madrid, whose acquirements in Arabic being extensive, will unlock the key to the important and valuable collection of the Escurial, the Royal Library, the Library of the Jesuits, and those of the Academy of History, and of the archbishop of Toledo. He has discovered two dramatic pieces in Arabic, somewhat resembling the ancient English mysteries—a description of writing hitherto supposed to be unknown to the Semitic races. The second volume of the History of the Afghans, by Prof. Dorn, is in press. The committee have made arrangements for the early completion of the travels of Macarius, translated by Belfour; those of Evliya Efendi, translated by M. Von Hammer; and the Maritime Wars of the Turks, translated by Dr. Mitchell. The Baron de Sacy has furnished the committee with an original treatise on the principles of the Arabic language, by Eben Malek, entitled the Alfiyya, with a commentary in French, intended as an appendix to de Sacy's Arabic Grammar. The committee have commenced the printing of a translation into Latin of the great Arabic Bibliographical Dictionary of Haji Khalifah, by Prof. Flugel. The first volume of 500 pages is completed. It is printing at Leipsic. This dictionary was the foundation of the great Bibliothèque Orientale d'Herbelot, and its translation has long been a desideratum among the learned of Europe. Prof. Wilson, of Oxford, with the sanction of the committee, has undertaken the publication of a curious mythological, historical, and bibliographical Sanscrit Dictionary, and also an original elementary work on Sanscrit Grammar.—*Bib. Rep.*

A CARD.

The publisher of the "*Protestant Episcopal Pulpit*" laments the necessity which compels him to offer this brief notice to the attention of his brother Churchmen.

In common with many others, he shared heavily in the calamity occasioned a short time since, by the most extensive and ruinous fire which New-York has witnessed for thirty years. All the property which he possessed immediately connected with the "*Pulpit*" was entirely destroyed; not a copy of the former volumes, nor of the present was saved; and the march of the flames was so rapid, that even his books could not be rescued. *All* subscribers will therefore please send him their names. The engraved plates of the heads of some of our bishops, together with sermons in manuscript, kindly furnished by some of the gentlemen of the clergy for publication, were lost. He, therefore, trusts, that in announcing his determination to persevere in publishing the "*Pulpit*," through arrangements he is about making, and determining it shall take a higher stand than *ever*, his brethren will not deem him obtrusive, should he say that, under the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed, he hopes that his fellow-members of the Church will not forget him. He asks for their subscriptions; and of the clergy, he requests the continuance of their past kindness, in furnishing him with manuscripts, and solicits their good offices in procuring for him new subscribers. If but two such were furnished from each Episcopal congregation, it would materially tend to diminish the loss which has been sustained. A few hundred sets of the present volume 5, will be reprinted and in readiness to deliver as soon as possible. (As above observed,) all *old* as well as *new* subscribers will please send in their names and address as soon as practicable.

The office of the "*Pulpit*" is now at Clinton Hall, No. 131 Nassau-street. All agents, and those concerned for the work, are desired to send in whatever names may be upon their respective lists, as new mail and subscription books must be made out.

John Moore.

Pulpit Office, Clinton Hall, No. 131 Nassau-street.
New-York, August 20, 1835.

NOTICE.

A Meeting of the Corporation "for the Relief of Widows and Children of Clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-York," will be held in the City of Utica, on Friday, the 2d of October, A. D. 1835.

Evan M. Johnson, *Sec.*

The (Auburn) Gospel Messenger will please copy this.

NOTICE.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

An adjourned meeting of the Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, will be held in Trinity Church, New-York, on Tuesday, September the 1st, at 5 o'clock P. M. By order,

H. Anthon, *Secretary.*

Calendar.

AUGUST.

23. 10th Sunday after Trinity.
24. St. Bartholomew.
30. 11th Sunday after Trinity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The Subscriber acknowledges the receipt of the following sums toward the erection of a Protestant Episcopal Church, Indianapolis, Indiana.—

From Rev. Jackson Kemper, D. D.,	$15 00
Mrs. Ralph,	10 00
Mrs. Dascam,	2 00
Mr. Hnlbel,	2 00
Mr. Holly,	1 00
Mrs. Banning,	1 00
Miss Kemper,	5 00

Melancthon Hoyt.

Bishop Chase acknowledges, for the purpose of supporting a Sunday School Teacher and Lay-reader in Illinois, as follows:—

From Miss C. C.	$5 00
" M. C.	2 50
An Episcopalian,	50 00

The latter sum being the first intalment of the sum of $500 to be continued in semi-annual payments (provided the donor live) until the whole is paid.

Letters have been received at the N. Y. Prot. Episcopal Press, during the week ending August 20th from the following persons, viz.

Postmaster, Towanda, Pa.—Rev. L. T. Bennett—Rev. Henry Gregory—Rev. E. G. Gear, *with remit.*—Charles Stimpson, jr.—Wm. M. Morrison—Thomas Latimer—Rev. Henry Anthon, D. D.—John C. Pechin, *with remit. of note*—Right Rev. Bishop Doane—Postmaster, Charlestown—A. Smith, Postmaster, *with remit.*—Postmaster, Cleaveland, Ohio—Marshall, Brown & Co.—Joseph Gill—Wm. Marshall & Co.

Received by the Gen. Prot. Episc. S. S. Union.

Rev. N. E. Cornwall—E. Platt, *with remit.*—Rev. Henry M. Davis—Rev. A. S. Todd—Rev. J. Kemper, D. D.—Rev. Henry Gregory, *with remit.*—Rev. L. T. Bennett—Postmaster, Lewiston, N. Y., *with remit.*—Postmaster, Windsor, Vt. *with remit.*

TEACHER WANTED.

A Gentleman qualified to teach the Languages, may hear of an eligible situation, in the West, by application at the office of the Churchman. $500 per annum, is offered for the tuition of twenty scholars.

BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL.

Miss C. Roberts' *Boarding and Day School*, 43 Walker-street, will re-open, after the Summer Vacation, on Thursday, the 10th day of September next. July 29.

FORREST & MULLIGAN'S COLLEGIATE SCHOOL,
45 Warren-street.

The Summer vacation will commence on the 1st of August next, and the School will be re-opened on the 31st, at 115 Franklin-street.

The Principals, in addition to the course of instruction hitherto pursued, have made such arrangements as will enable them, in future, to prepare young gentlemen for the higher classes in any of the Colleges, and to extend to such as may desire it, without entering College, a more enlarged course of instruction in English, the Classics, and Mathematics, than is generally afforded in schools.

The following gentlemen are engaged as instructers in the different departments —

Professor Mulligan, Latin and Greek Languages.
" Ernenputsch, Latin, Greek and German.
" Parmentier, French Language.
" Velasquez, Spanish do.
" Adrain, Mathematics.
William Forrest, Mathematics, Geography, History, &c.
William McGuckin, Mental Arithmetic, &c.
William Edwards, Book-keeping.
Goold Brown, English Grammar.
Charles M. Ingersoll, Rhetoric, &c.
John M. Holley, Geography, History, &c. &c.
Joseph Barber, Reading and Elocution.
William Jones, Writing.
John W. Martin, Drawing.

The Preparatory Department, designed for boys between six and eight, is continued under the instruction of Mr. E. W. Morse.

Circulars, containing terms, &c. will be left at the Bookstores of Leavitt, Lord & Co., Broadway, and Mr. R. Carter's, corner of Canal and Laurens streets.

---

* We lamented to see the British and Foreign School Society, whose schools are a model for Scriptural education, advertising as its chairman, at the present moment, Lord John Russell, and in his absence, soliciting for that office, Lord Brougham; who, we lament also to hear, (for we could not allow ourselves to see,) took the chair at the meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society. If societies are thus reckless of public opinion, they will rue the consequences. Lord Brougham was more in his place in the chair of the Dissenters' Protection Society [what *protection* do Dissenters need? It is the Church of England that requires *protection*,] and assisting Mr O'Connell to ridicule and disparage the constituted orders of the country, after the fashion of Isaac Tomkins, Peter Jenkins, and Timothy Winterbottom, which the public attribute to his Lordship's pen, though we presume, only by guess by the style, and on the well-known ground that

"Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do."

Catesby, the principal agent in the Gunpowder Plot, declared that "he made little account of the nobility, as being atheists, fools, and cowards; and that lusty bodies would be better for the commonwealth than they." We have many Catesbys now-a-days. Let Christians and patriots, and all honest men, beware of them.

Liberal Religion,

Or Poetic Flowers Gone to Seed.

Old women long have chatter'd, priests have raved
Of fallen Adam, and a world depraved;
But spite of priests, and in old women's spite,
"One truth is clear—whatever is, is right."
This being true, I ask the bigot throng,—
Triumphant ask,—Pray, what or who is wrong?

Ye, ye are wrong, and here your error see,
Who judge of man as if his acts were free.
"Account for moral, as for natural things;"
Stern fate in both each new mutation brings:
None blame the av'lanche from the mountain's brow
Down thundering, to the affrighted vale below—
No more the husband blame, whose murd'rous knife
Seeks the fair bosom of a faithful wife:
Fate is supreme, at her resistless call
The wife must perish, and the av'lanche fall.

"If plagues and earthquakes break not Heaven's design,
Why then a Borgia or a Cataline?"
If plagues and earthquakes Heaven's design promote,
Why not the man who cuts his father's throat?
This precious truth, "Whatever is, is right,"
Creation cinctures in a robe of light;
Another *follows*, sweet it goes in song,
The *action* right, the *actor* can't be wrong;

Thieving is right, as part of Heaven's great plan,
The thief then surely is an honest man:
Blame not the swindler, with his coffers swell'd,
At your expense; he acted as impell'd:
Nature requires not "ever cloudless skies,"
And why then man "for ever just and wise?"

"Say not that man 's imperfect"—odious thought!
"Say rather man 's as perfect as he ought;"
And if the *race* can pure perfection claim,
Each *individual* may do just the same.

Shout, then, ye rogues and ruffians, great and small,
Villains and cut-throats, perfect are ye all!
"As perfect as ye ought," I said before,
And pray who *would* be, nay, who *should* be more?
Another glorious truth demands my lay,
'T is this, O man!—"To enjoy is to obey,"
Lo! then the mind from all inquiry eased,
By this plain rule, "You 're virtuous, when you 're pleased."
Call it enjoyment, pleasure, glee, or fun,
Where'er you find it, there God's will is done.
Go, happy mortal then, on duty haste,
And in what fashion, just consult your taste.
"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."
But "all is right;" proof follows then as strong
As verse can make it, that no faith is wrong.
Whether adoring serpent, beast or bird,
In point of faith, no man has ever err'd.
The African's fetisch, the Persian's flame,
"Jehovah, Jove, or Lord," 't is all the same,
God or no God, your creed has no defect,
Provided always that your life 's correct.
And so it *must be* as was shown before;
Be easy then, O man, "and God adore,"
If you *believe* in him:—if not, O man,"
Why *then* be easy—easy as you can.

From the Journal of the Kentucky Convention.

BISHOP SMITH'S ADDRESS TO THE CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF KENTUCKY.

Brethren and Friends,—Though absent from you in body, yet not in spirit, I rejoice with you at all the good which Almighty God hath done for us since we last met. A single year brings with it great and unexpected changes. But whilst on other occasions we have been called upon to advert to them in deep humility as signally afflictive, all unworthy as we are, we are now bound to speak of them as most unexpectedly merciful. The work so disproportioned to our numbers and means, which we commenced a few years since with anxiety and trembling, has at length received the marked approval of large portions of the Church throughout our country; and our Theological Seminary, which a year since existed chiefly upon paper and in the wishes and hopes of the few who laid its foundation in tears, may now be considered as permanently established, at least on a small scale. Funds have been contributed, chiefly by the bounty of our benevolent friends in New-York, sufficient to relieve the Trustees from all anxiety as to meeting the payments upon the buildings, which may now be considered as the property of the Church. Beyond this, a commencement has been made, by contributions in books and money, for the establishment of a library,—a subscription of $500 a-year, for three years, has been made in the Church of the Ascension in New-York, and strong assurances given in Boston that we shall be provided with a press. Nor has the generosity of our friends been content with relieving us from the most painful of our embarrassments relative to our seminary: a fund of $1000 has been placed at my disposal by members of the Church of the Ascension in the city of New-York, for the purpose of aiding feeble parishes by loans without interest, in the erection of small places of worship.

For these fruits of their Christian liberality, and for the uniform and great kindness with which I have everywhere been received;—for the sympathy excited in behalf of the West, and the prayers which have ascended and are still ascending to the Father of Mercies on our account, I am confident that you will all feel with me the liveliest gratitude, and that you will be happy in uniting with me in this public acknowledgment of so great Christian kindness. May the God of all grace be the rewarder and the portion of all those who, in any manner, have lent us a helping hand!

These large and unexpected results have not been brought about without effort. The way was admirably well prepared for my departure from Louisville for the East on the 1st of December last, by a visit thither on the part of Dr. Cooke, from which he had previously returned little more than a month. Most of my time has been spent in New-York, Philadelphia and Boston, but whilst our brethren in all these cities have done nobly for us, yet by far the largest amount has been contributed in New-York. It is hoped that our collections will be mainly closed before the meeting of the Trustees of the Seminary in November, and of course that their treasurer will then have it in his power to make an accurate report of all the sums received, and of the manner in which they have been expended.

So much of the past ecclesiastical year has been spent by me in distant exertions in behalf of the Diocese, that the usual details of this address are necessarily confined to narrow limits. During that period there have been four confirmations, at which 26 persons were confirmed. The list of our candidates for Holy Orders remains as before, with the exception of Luther H. Van Doren, who was dismissed at his own request on the 12th of November, 1834, and of John Drummond, who presented letters dismissory from the Bishop of North-Carolina on the 10th of January, 1835. Mr. Edmund Davis and Mr. M. L. Forbes, the first-fruits of our theological seminary, were admitted to Deacon's Orders on Sunday the 9th of November, 1834, in Christ Church, Lexington. On the 30th of the same month, the Rev. D. H. Deacon, then in Deacon's Orders, was admitted to the order of Priest. The other additions to our numbers have been—by subscription under the xxiiid canon, the Rev. Wm. M'Callen, late of the Diocese of Killaloe, Ireland, on the 7th of January, 1835; and by letters dismissory from the Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, the Rev. T. W. Coit, D. D., whom you are about to welcome amongst you as president of Transylvania University. Immediately after his ordination, the Rev. M. L. Forbes repaired to Tennessee, to act, during one year, as the assistant of the Bishop of that Diocese On the 30th of October, I received a communication from the Bishop of Pennsylvania announcing that he had removed the Rev. John Davis from the ministry of the Church, agreeably to the provisions of the xxxixth canon.

Several points have been deeply impressed upon my mind during my absence, relative to the peculiar demands of the field of labor committed to us.

In the absence of a sufficient number of clergymen to occupy important spheres of labor, and in the want of all compensation for them at these points, might not something be effected on the part of the clergy, by occasional visits, or regular excursions even at great intervals, at least toward paving the way for a stated missionary? Might not more be done, if the clergy would enter into agreement one with another, to perform in the course of the year a certain amount of missionary labor?

Are the clergy and active laymen sufficiently impressed with the greatness of the work we have undertaken, to supply the wants of as many theological students as God in his providence may be pleased to cast upon our bounty? Does not the education department of our diocesan society require prompt and zealous attention? That system of measures which will meet the wants of our young men and the expectations which have been raised, must be energetic far beyond our numbers, and liberal up to the full measure of the ability which God hath given! Shall the friends of our seminary be constrained to say, We have indeed been furnished with buildings and with a valuable theological library, chiefly by the bounty of distant Episcopalians, for the accommodation of many students, but we are obliged to turn away young men, for the want of charity to sustain them during their course of study? God forbid!

Permit me, before I close, to add one word relative to that unhappy and sadly-neglected race, our colored population. None can be more fully sensible than I am of the great difficulty of approaching them with the blessings which the Church has it in her power to bestow upon them. Strangers to her services, and almost equally so to the spirit which actuates her clergy, with difficulty can they be brought to listen to the truth at our lips, or to receive the richest blessings at our hands. But does this exonerate us from reiterated attempts, as long as hope shall last, to bless them, even against their will? If their estrangement or unfriendliness is a good reason why our hearts should not yearn over them in Christian compassion, why then are missionaries sent to the reluctant Heathen, or why did the Son of God come unto his own, when he knew full well that they would not receive him? No such aversion, but what can be overcome by uniform Christian kindness, by perseverance in efforts for their good, which prejudice itself must know to be disinterested! In the name of the great Head of the Church, I commend them to your care! For his sake I beseech you to look after the souls of those young persons of the colored race, who are or who may be committed to your care; or who, by any possible efforts or sacrifice on your part, may be made better acquainted with their duty, with the way of salvation through Jesus Christ, and with the hopes and consolations of his blessed Gospel.

And now, brethren, let me beseech you, by your counsels and prayers and efforts to endeavor to supply my lack of service to the flock from which I have so long been separated, and let me not be forgotten in your prayers, that I may be preserved from all dangers, be prospered in the work to which I am now devoted, and in God's good time be brought back to you in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of peace. "Finally, brethren, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of peace shall be with you—he shall build you up and give you an inheritance amongst all those who are sanctified."

Your affectionate brother and servant in Christ,

B. B. Smith.

New-York, May 28th, 1835.

From the British Magazine.

THE DARK AGES.

Bibliothekar. Haben sie des *Muratorius* seine Werke nicht gelesen?
P. Priszilian. In meinem Leben nicht; ich kenne sie gar nicht.
Die Heiligen.

I have already observed that there is often great difficulty in meeting broad general assertions, even when one is sure that they are untrue; and I may add that it is as difficult—perhaps it is impossible—to prevent or remove the erroneous impressions likely to arise from statements which are in fact verbally true. My meaning will be illustrated by considering the statement with which Robertson follows those already discussed.

> 'Many circumstances prove the scarcity of books during these ages. Private persons seldom possessed any books whatever. Even monasteries of considerable note had only one missal.—*Murat. Antiq.*, vol. ix. p. 789.'

Certainly there needs no proof that books were scarce during the middle ages. No doubt the scarcity, as compared with the plenty, and even surfeit, of the present day, was great indeed. Yet, great as it was, I cannot help suspecting that it has been exaggerated; and I think we shall find ground to doubt the truth of the assertion that 'private persons seldom possessed any books whatever;' or if, by assigning a lax and comparative meaning to 'seldom,' the statement should be turned into a notorious truth not worth mentioning, we shall see reason for believing that the impression which it was calculated to convey, and probably has conveyed to most readers, is erroneous. To come, however, to the specific statement, backed by the authority of Muratori—for my present business is chiefly with it—'even monasteries of considerable note had only one missal.' In the first place, will any body tell me what they wanted with more? 'Monasteries of considerable note' had but one church, or chapel, and not more inmates than that one building would contain; and might not mass be said every hour of every day all the year round, out of *one* missal, as well as if there had been fifty? 'Yes,' it may be said, 'but one is accustomed to look on monasteries as having been, in some small and comparative degree, places where there was *some* learning, and some appearance, at least, of religion; and one is surprised to hear of *their* being so ill provided with books.' I know it—I know that no man who has any tolerable acquaintance with history, sacred or secular, can help having some idea—perhaps a very vague and discouraged idea—that in those ages the monastery was the refuge of want and weakness, the nursery of art, the depository of learning, and the sanctuary of religion. This, I say, every man who is moderately acquainted with history must know; even though he should not be aware of the less obvious, but not less certain influence of monastic institutions on agriculture, commerce, and those comforts and pleasures of social life from which their inmates were themselves excluded. Something like this, I repeat, every tolerably educated man does feel; but a strange sort of vague contradiction is thrown over it by such foolish statements as that which I have quoted from Robertson. Half the readers of his History of Charles V. do not know what a missal is, or why the monks wanted any, or what they did with that single one which they are admitted to have had; but yet, from the way in which it is stated, they take it for granted that it was a horrible delinquency in 'monasteries of considerable note' to have only one missal; and if *they* were so wretchedly off, in what state were the thousands of monasteries which were of inconsiderable note, or of no note at all? But, to say the truth, all this, though not, I hope, untrue or entirely useless, is not to our present purpose; as the reader will find if he refers to Muratori, or favors me with his attention to a brief statement of the grounds on which Robertson ventured to make his assertion.

The Abbot Bonus appears to have been born about the year 990; and, though the place of his birth is not certainly known, it seems probable that he was a native of Pisa. At all events we are informed that he became a monk at Nonantula, and that he and his uncle Peter came from thence in the year 1018, to Pisa, where they laid the foundation of the monastery of St. Michael, which certainly was afterward 'of considerable note.' Bonus presided over it for thirty years; after which period some dispute or dissension (it does not clearly appear of what nature, but it seems not to have been a quarrel with his monks) caused him to quit his monastery, and set off for Corsica, where some property had been bequeathed to him, and where he proposed to live as a private person. Stopping, however, on his voyage at the island of Gorgona, where there was a monastery, he found the monks greatly distressed by the recent loss of their abbot. They unanimously called on Bonus to take his place. He resisted for some time; but overcome by their importunity, he consented; requesting only leave to return to Pisa, in order to bid farewell to his old associates, and to exhort them with respect to the choice of a successor. Having obtained permission, and executed his purpose, he returned to Gorgona, and undertook the office of abbot there, which he held until his death, in the year 1070. On quitting the monastery at Pisa, however, he wrote a statement of what he had done in the matter of founding and maintaining it; and it is to this 'Breve Recordationis,' printed by Muratori, in the fourth volume (not the ninth, for there are but six) of his *Antiquitates Italicæ medii ævi* that Robertson refers.*

I by no means suppose that the Abbot did or could foresee what inferences would be drawn from a fact which he relates; but really, if he had, he could hardly have told his story in terms more adapted to preclude the possibility of such perversion. The monastery 'of considerable note' (that is, as the Abbot says, 'que *nunc* est cœnobium') was *then* no monastery at all, but a chapel near Pisa, (*capella, que tunc temporis detinebatur a presbyteris,*) which was in a most deplorable and destitute condition, when 'Senior Stephanus,' I presume the principal authority in Pisa, procured this poor monk to come and perform Divine service. Not only does Bonus call it a chapel, but he tells us that when he came there he found *neither monk nor abbot*, nor any decent dwelling place, and in fact nothing but a hut. (*Neque monachum, neque abbatem ibidem inveni; et non casam neque mansionem sed tantummodo unum tugurium, ubi cepi habitare cum avunculo meo.*) He then proceeds to detail the destitute state of the church as to service books, vestments, bells, and all the requisites for the performance of Divine service; and, having given a lamentable picture, he breaks out with honest pride—may I not hope with real and pious gratitude?—'Now hear and understand how that place is improved by the help of Almighty God, and by mine, and by that of my monks, and that of the good Christians of our city.' After five years he set to work on the church, and went to Rome, where he bought columns for it; and then made a belfry, which he furnished with two bells, but which, fifteen years afterward, gave place to one much handsomer, containing seven bells, the largest of which weighed twelve hundred pounds. The vestments, by the time when the Abbot wrote, had not only increased in number, but some of them were so costly that, as the Abbot tells us, the bishop of the diocese might have said mass in them on Easter Sunday, 'cum honore'—the single tin cup had been exchanged for four chalices, one of gold and three of silver—the single hut had expanded into a monastery, with all suitable offices and appendages, and a considerable estate in land; and, what is more to our purpose, instead of the single missal, the monks of the monastery of St. Michael rejoiced in a library consisting of thirty-four volumes. But this requires more specific notice, for it is the ground of Robertson's statement.

In describing the destitute state of the chapel as he originally found it, the Abbot tells us, 'In ipsa ecclesia non inveni aliud nisi unum missale;' and afterward he repeats, 'Quando veni in ipsum locum non legebatur in ipsa ecclesia, per totum fere annum, nisi epistole et evangelia quia non habebatur nisi unum missale.' Now, the first thing to observe is, that which indeed I have already stated, that there is no pretence for calling the place a monastery at all at the time when it had only one missal. Secondly, that in speaking of 'one missal,' Robertson obviously misunderstands the drift of the Abbot's complaint, which was not that the chapel had only a single missal, but that it had no service-book but a missal; and that, therefore, only that service could be performed which was contained in the missal. *Unus*, in writers of that period, whether Italian, French, or German, no more implies definite singularity than the corresponding word in either of those languages now does. We alone, I believe, have discarded it, or turned it into 'a,' and are apt to smile when our foreign friends very naturally say, 'Here is one book,' &c. Thirdly, let it be observed that as soon as this place did become a monastery it began to have books. And this seems to me the more creditable, because, during a great part of the time the monks were in want of the comforts, and even perhaps of the necessaries of life, and what they got was principally obtained by begging. The great and ruling passion of the poor Abbot seems to have been to form a monastery, and provide it with every thing needful; and, as to himself, he tells us that for the first two years he had only a single shirt, and used to lie in bed while it was washed; and that during the whole thirty years he was never possessed of two suits of clothes, or a horse. As to the books, however, I must give the list in his own words, grammar and spelling:

Sermonum liber unus quem ego scripsi solus cum Priore meo, sicut habetur domui Sancte Marie, valde optimus.
Liber Historiarum unus, ubi continetur quidquid in sancta ecclesia pertinet ad legendum per totum annum.
Textum Evangeliorum unum, valde optime scriptum, cum tabule de argento valde bone.
Passionarium unum novum, ubi sunt omnes passiones ecclesiastice.
Tractatum super Genesis, Sancti Augustini liber unus.
Missales quinque; unum missale valde optimum, quod semper in arca manebit, valentem solidos C.
Dialogorum, liber unus.
Moralium Job, liber unus.
Summum, bonum, liber unus.
Diadema, liber unus.
Paradisi, liber unus.
Glossarum, liber unus.
Canones, liber unus.
Sancti Benedicti Regula, liber unus.
Pastorale, liber unus.
Antiphonarii VIII.
Quinque Diurnales.
Tres Nocturnales.
Liber Bibliothece † novum quod est comparatum libras decem.
Super Ezechiel, liber unus.
Libri Psalmorum valde optimi V.

Now I am quite aware that this catalogue may draw a smile from those who are conversant with modern collections, but I am not ashamed to say that I honor the man who, under such circumstances, had the spirit, and found the means, to rebuild or enlarge his church, to provide all things necessary for the honorable performance of Divine service, to annex a monastery, and make a beginning for a school of learning. Let me also (partly to illustrate what I have said in the preceding number, and partly to prepare the way for what I hope more fully to show) request the reader to observe the nature of the books in this little list,—are they legendary tales of saints? mere lies and rubbish? But more of this, I hope, hereafter.

Having said so much of the Abbot Bonus, I am anxious to proceed to the account which Robertson gives of the Abbot Lupus; but I wish first to add a few words respecting the canons and the Abbot Regino. In the second number I stated that I had not got the original work of the Abbot; but since that number was printed, the kindness of a learned friend has furnished me with the book, and I am desirous to give the passage as it really stands. Besides, I am induced to recur to the subject, because, after I had written the preceding part of this paper, I happened to take up a 'History of Switzerland, designed for young persons,' published by Harvey and Darton in 1825, which tells the rising generation that 'so small were the qualifications thought requisite for the priesthood before the Reformation, that candidates were admitted to Holy Orders if they could only read, and tolerably understand what they read.' p. 237. This, I presume, is taken from Robertson's statement that 'one of the questions appointed to be put to candidates for Orders, was this, "Whether they could read the gospels and epistles, and explain the sense of them, at least, literally."' It may be said (and is very likely to be said by any body who may take the trouble to read such a paper as this) that though this History of Switzerland costs six shillings, it is only a child's book, that they never heard of it, and that it is not worth notice. To this I answer, first, that children's books are not read by children only, and it was not in the hands of a child that I found this book; and that, in my opinion, even children should not be set to read lies; secondly, I confess that I never saw the book until this very day, but I do hold it to be very well worth notice as an instance of the way in which the errors of popular writers are copied and disseminated, and dribbled down in minor publications. To come, however, to the point, the inquiry does not at all respect candidates for Orders, but is one which a bishop is directed to make in all the cures in his diocese. I may, probably, have occasion to recur to it again, but for the present it may be enough to say that it is entitled, 'Inquisitio de his quæ Episcopus vel ejus ministri in suo districtu vel territorio inquirere debeant per vicos, pagos, atque parrœcheas suæ dioceseos.' It suggests ninety-five points of inquiry; of which the first fifteen relate to the church, its state of repair, and the requisites for the performance of Divine service. No. 16–73, concern the life and conversation of the priest. No. 74–80, respect points on which the priest was to be personally questioned; that is, as to his parentage, place of birth, by what bishop he was ordained, &c. No. 81–95, relate to his ministry, (Posthæc de ministerio sibi commisso inquirendum est,) and it is that part of the 83d and 85th which I mark by italics that is quoted by Brucker,‡ but I must extract the two which precede:—'Si expositionem symboli atque orationis dominicæ juxta traditionem orthodoxorum patrem penes se scriptam habeat, et eam pleniter intellegat, et inde prædicando populum sibi commissum sedulo instruat. 82. Si orationes Missarum, præfationem quoque canonis, et eundem canonem bene intellegat, et memoriter ac distincte proferre valeat. 83. *Si epistolam et evangelium bene legere possit atque saltem ad litteram ejus sensum manifestare* 84. Si psalmorum verba et distinctiones regulariter ex corde cum canticis consuetudinariis pronuntiare sciat. 85. *Si sermonem Athanasii Episcopi de fide Sanctæ Trinitatis* cujus initium est "Quicunque vult salvus esse" *memoriter teneat, et sensum illius intellegat, et verbis communibus enuntiare sciat.*' The remaining ten questions inquire minutely as to his capability to perform different parts of the service, and the 94th inquires, 'Si habeat quadraginta homilias Gregorii et eos studiose legat atque intellegat.' To say nothing of the erroneous application of this document to the examination of candidates for Orders, is it not most extraordinary that it should have been brought forward to prove that the clergy could not read?

(*To be continued.*)

---

* It was, I believe, first printed by Mabillon, then by Grandius, (an abbot of St. Michael's, who, after seven centuries, erected a statue in honor of his predecessor, Bonus,) by Muratori, to whom Robertson refers; and, fourthly, by Mitarelli and Costadoni, in their 'Annales Camaldulenses.' This latter work contains, I believe, the fullest account of the Abbot, and to it I am indebted for the facts and extracts which I here give.

† I hope to give some catalogues relating to the period with which we are engaged, which will offer a fitter opportunity for saying something of these and other books; but I am apprehensive that some readers may not know that *Bibliotheca* was, in those days, the Latin, or at least the name for a Bible. Will the Protestant reader give the Abbot and his monks any credit for buying it, at so early a period of their monastery, for so great a price? And, honestly, (but quite between ourselves,) would he have expected to find that book in the list?

‡ Of this, indeed, Robertson ought to have been aware, for Brucker introduces it as a 'formula inquisitionis . . . . . secundam quam inquirere debebat Episcopus per vicos, &c. . . . In ea enim *inter alia* circa *prebyterum* jubetur inquiri, "Si,"' &c.

From the (London) Christian Observer.

THE PATH OF DUTY IS THE PATH OF PEACE AND SAFETY.

Psalm xci. 11, 12.

Mr. S——, a country gentleman and magistrate, resided at B——, in the vicinage of Cork. Early in the last century a prisoner charged with sheep-stealing was brought to his house; and while Mr. S—— was engaged in writing a committal, and the bailiffs in making the necessary preparations for carrying forward the prisoner, the latter was placed for safe custody in a yard enclosed by a lofty wall. In this yard a child, son to Mr. S——, and afterward father to the lady who related to me this anecdote, was amusing himself with some childish sports. The prisoner was in early youth. He had but just entered upon his vicious career, and his feelings and fears were not yet extinguished and rendered callous by habitual crime. He sat down upon a stone in the yard, placed his head between his knees, and wept bitterly. The child was immediately arrested in his play by this piteous spectacle, and, with all the veneration which deep sorrow secures from every feeling mind, drew near to the sufferer, and timidly inquired why he wept. The prisoner, hunted down by all, sinking in despair, and perhaps catching at the slender hope which the sympathy of the *magistrate's child* held out to him, told, with all the pathos of real wo, the tale of his sorrows, and wrought powerfully upon the feelings of the child. His first reply was a rapid and earnest inquiry, 'Why don't you run away from them?' The man pointed to the lofty wall and locked door, and said, 'How can I?' This difficulty the child at once overruled by saying, 'I will let you out,' and, without waiting a reply, ran quickly into the house. I will not say he *stole* the key, for he never thought of any objection against his using it, but quite the contrary: in the most perfect simplicity and good feeling he took it, unobserved, from the table at which his father was writing the committal; unlocked the wicket, through which with a hurried step and parting blessing the prisoner quickly escaped; and when the committal was made out, and the bailiffs were ready, the object of all these preparations had safely fled.

Years, too, fled rapidly. The child became a man, and put away childish things. He substituted—I fear it may be said of those days—the foxhunt and carousal, those rational enjoyments of manhood, for the top and ball and hoop, the simple sports of childhood; and may it not be said of *any* days, until the Millennial, the heavy and up-hill drag of worldly business and worldly cares, for the alternating business and relaxation, tears and laughter, of the school-room and the play-ground.

In the course of business, Mr. S——, who had now succeeded to the property of his deceased father, had a large engagement to meet at the Cork bank. Disappointed by tenants, the utmost provision which he could make for it in the country fell short of its amount, and he found it imperatively necessary to get into Cork the night before the bill was payable, that he might make arrangements to prevent its being dishonored. He arrived at Mallow as the day closed. At that time the road between Mallow and Cork was infested by a desperate gang of highwaymen, and robberies of an intrepid and ferocious character were of frequent occurrence. The experiment of travelling this road at night, and with a large sum of money, was most hazardous; but credit was at stake, and there was no alternative. He arrived safely at White Church, a ruin within about five miles of Cork, and there, at an angle in the road, was stopped by a footpad, who with a pistol to his breast demanded his purse. He frankly told his circumstances, but an appeal or remonstrance was unavailing. Money and credit were now gone: and perhaps at this moment Mr. S—— might have thought with a sigh upon the careless and disengaged hours of childhood, and deemed its peaceful calm but ill compensated by that independence of manhood after which it so intensely breathes, with all the vexing cares and harassing turmoil which manhood brings along with it.

It was a moonlight night, occasionally dimmed by floating clouds. Just as the robbery was completed, and the highwayman, looking up, commanded him to go forward, the moon suddenly emerged from behind a dark cloud, and shone full upon the face of Mr. S——. The highwayman for a moment looked upon the countenance with an intense and searching gaze, and then abruptly demanded, 'What is your name?' This was to Mr. S—— no gratifying recognition. Mr. S—— had succeeded his father in the magistracy as well as estate, and discharged its duties with zeal and efficiency. The thought naturally at once rushed into his mind, 'This is some felon who has been brought before me and punished, and, if he recognises, will assuredly murder me.' He was just about to give a *false* name, when the better thought was suggested, 'I am under awful circumstances: if I am this moment to pass into eternity, let it not be with a lie upon my lips: "My name is Spread."' The highwayman, as if transformed by some magic spell, in manner, accent, and feature, and with a voice whose softened and subdued tone seemed to make a faint appeal to the memory of Mr. S——, asked, with feeling and respect 'Do you remember, Sir, the prisoner that you let out of your father's yard at Ballycanna nineteen years ago?' Mr. S—— did not immediately recollect the circumstances, but they were soon recalled to his memory. The highwayman said, 'I, Sir, am the man whose life you that day mercifully saved.' He returned him his purse. He said, 'This would little avail you: there are six men at different points on the road between you and Cork, that, if a traveller escapes one, another may meet and secure him.' In answer to some questions of Mr. S——, he confessed it not at all improbable, that if he were found empty, and the account of his previous robbery not credited by the next who stopped him, he might be murdered. He walked by the side of Mr. S——'s horse; conducted him safely through the gang to the turnpike at Blackpool, in the suburbs of Cork; and, at parting, compelled him to receive gold sufficient to complete his engagement at the bank. Mr. S—— gave him much advice, and many promises of protection and security if he would abandon his evil course; and he promised, that, when he could extricate himself with safety at once to his comrades and himself, he would break off from the confederacy, and place himself under Mr. S——'s protection.

Had Mr. S—— followed that first impulse of the natural heart, which would have led him to withdraw himself by falsehood from the protection of Providence—had he rejected the monitor within, which told him (conscience echoing the word of God,) that 'Whosoever would save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life in this world shall keep it until life eternal'—what *then* would his benevolence have effected? It would have resuscitated a viper to sting him. It would have nerved the paralyzed arm which was to rob him of property, of credit, perhaps of life itself.

This anecdote furnishes, as appears to me, a powerful and pleasing illustration of the importance of placing ourselves continually, as Scripture directs, with Christian simplicity and rectitude of principle and conduct, under the protection of a good Providence; and, in every critical emergency, endeavoring to realize by faith the presence and the guardian care of God. It teaches and encourages us never to withdraw ourselves from that charmed circle within which all things work together for good, and whose limits and immunities the Apostle thus describes: 'Who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good? But, and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye; and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled: but sanctify the Lord God in your hearts—having a good conscience.'

LUTHER'S OPINION OF THE PSALMS.

Where do we find a sweeter voice of joy than in the Psalms of thanksgiving and praise? There you look all the saints in the heart, as in a beautiful garden, as into heaven itself; whose delicate, sweet, and lovely flowers are springing up there, of all manner of beautiful, joyous thought toward God and his goodness! And, again, where do you find deeper, more mournful and weeping words of sorrow than the plaintive Psalms contain? There again you look all the saints in the heart; but as into death, yea, as into hell, where it is all dark and gloomy, from all manner of melancholy apprehensions of God's displeasure! I hold that there never has appeared on earth, and never can appear a more precious book of examples and legends of saints, than the Psalter is. For here we find not merely what one or two holy men have done, but what the Head himself of all the saints has done, and what all the saints do still. How they feel toward God, toward friends and enemies; how they behave and sustain themselves in all dangers and sufferings. Besides, all manner of Divine and statutory instructions and commands are contained therein. Hence, too, it comes, that the Psalter forms, as it were, *a little book of all saints*, in which every man, in whatever situation he may be placed, shall find psalms and sentiments which shall apply to his own case, and be the same to him as if they were for his own sake, so expressed, that he could not express them himself, nor even wish them better than they are.

B. Curtis Brown, *Print.*